



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1, 2006

No. 24

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PORTER).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
March 1, 2006.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JON C. PORTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### PRAYER

Bishop Steven E. Wright, National Chaplain, the American Legion, offered the following prayer:

Our Father who art in heaven, we thank Thee for countless blessings poured out upon the people of this great Nation. From our earliest beginnings we have placed our trust in Thy power to guide and defend us. We reaffirm that trust as we seek Thy strength, Thy wisdom, Thy inspiration and Thy love to be upon our Representatives here in this House in their deliberations and efforts and decisions this day.

We thank Thee for the valiant men and women of our Armed Forces and for our veterans and ask Thee to bless them and their families with safety and with Thy comforting love. We pray likewise for each individual and family unit and ask Thee to particularly bless fathers and mothers with the ability to instill virtue in its many forms in their children.

We express our love and gratitude for Thy tender mercies in all our trials and challenges, and do so with a concluding moment of silence, allowing each here to offer the personal benediction of his or her own heart and faith.

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

After consultation among the Speaker, the majority and minority leaders, the Chair announces that during the joint meeting to hear an address by the Honorable Silvio Berlusconi, Prime Minister of the Republic of Italy, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those on his right and left will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

Due to the large attendance that is anticipated, the Chair feels the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly adhered to.

Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor, and the cooperation of all Members is requested.

The practice of reserving seats prior to the joint meeting by placard will

not be allowed. Members may reserve their seats by physical presence only following the security sweep of the Chamber.

### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, February 16, 2006, the House stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1055

### JOINT MEETING OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE SILVIO BERLUSCONI, PRIME MINISTER OF THE REPUBLIC OF ITALY

The Speaker of the House presided.

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms, Mrs. Kerri Hanley, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort the Honorable Silvio Berlusconi, the Prime Minister of the Republic of Italy, into the Chamber:

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER);

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA);

The gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY);

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA);

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI);

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H453

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI);

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER);

The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON);

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL);

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE);

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN); and

The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to escort the Honorable Silvio Berlusconi, the Prime Minister of the Republic of Italy, into the House Chamber:

The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST);

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL);

The Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS);

The Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM);

The Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI);

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN);

The Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY);

The Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON); and

The Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms announced the Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, His Excellency Roble Olhaye, Ambassador from the Republic of Djibouti.

The Dean of the Diplomatic Corps entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for him.

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The Members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 11 o'clock and 7 minutes a.m., the Deputy Sergeant at Arms announced the Honorable Silvio Berlusconi, Prime Minister of the Republic of Italy.

The Prime Minister of the Republic of Italy, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, it is my great privilege and I deem it a high honor and a personal pleasure to present to you the Honorable Silvio Berlusconi, Prime Minister of the Republic of Italy.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE SILVIO BERLUSCONI, PRIME MINISTER OF THE REPUBLIC OF ITALY

[Spoken in English:]

Prime Minister BERLUSCONI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, distinguished Members of Congress, it is an extraordinary honor to be invited to speak before you in the Capitol building, one of the great temples of democracy. I speak in representation and in the name of a country that has a deep friendship with the United States and is bound to your country by ties which go back many centuries.

Many American citizens have Italian roots. For them, the United States was a land of opportunity that welcomed them generously, and they contributed their intelligence and their labor to help make America great. And I am proud to see that so many Italian-Americans are today Members of the Congress of the greatest democracy in the world.

For my generation of Italians, the United States is the beacon of liberty, of civil and economic progress.

I will always be grateful to the United States for having saved my country from fascism and Nazism at the cost of so many young American lives. I will always be grateful to the United States for defending Europe from the Soviet threat in the long decades of the Cold War. By devoting so much to this victorious struggle against communism, the United States enabled us Europeans to employ our precious resources in the recovery and development of our economies.

I will always be grateful to the United States for having helped my country to climb out of poverty and achieve growth and prosperity after the Second World War thanks to the generosity of the Marshall Plan.

And today I am still grateful to the United States for the high price in lives you continue to pay in the fight against terrorism to assure our common security and defend human rights around the world.

As I will never tire of repeating, when I see your flag, I do not merely see the flag of a great country. Above all, I see a symbol, a universal symbol of freedom and democracy.

[Spoken in Italian:]

Mr. Speaker, these sentiments have inspired all of my political activity and the action of the governments that I have had the honor of leading.

The United States has always been able to count on a steadfast, loyal ally of the United States, ready to stand by you in defending liberty. We have demonstrated this wherever Italy's tangible help has been required, and we are deeply proud of this contribution.

Some 40,000 of our troops are assigned exclusively to peacekeeping operations.

In Afghanistan, we are now commanding NATO's ISAF mission.

In Iraq, we are involved in bringing peace and building democracy.

In the Balkans, Italy is now commanding the missions in Kosovo and Bosnia Herzegovina.

We are also present in the Middle East, in Sudan and other parts of the world, and in every other place where gaping wounds must be healed.

Mr. Speaker, before the barbaric attacks of September 11, Western countries basked in the certainty of their security. They basked in the certainty that, after the fall of the Berlin Wall, nothing could interfere with their civil and democratic life.

In 2001, in the early days of my second government, I was called to chair the G8 summit in Genoa. After the conclusion of the summit's official program, the final dinner became a dinner among friends. At one point that evening, I sat back slightly from the table, almost an external observer, in order to enjoy the cordial discussion among the leaders of the largest industrial countries of the world.

President Bush was chatting amiably with Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi of Japan. Pearl Harbor and Hiroshima were but a distant memory. Prime Minister Blair was joking with Chancellor Schroeder. And the President of the Russian Federation, Vladimir Putin, was also talking with President Bush. The tragedy of the Second World War and the Cold War, which had lasted for so many years, was forgotten. I felt great pleasure inside. I thought that the world had in fact changed, and how different and peaceful it was the world we were handing to our children. An age of lasting peace beckoned.

But just a few short months afterwards, the unthinkable occurred.

September 11 marked the beginning of an entirely different type of war from those that spilled the blood of humankind in centuries past. It is not a conflict between states, nor a clash of civilizations, because it is not an attack by Islam on the West. The moderate Islam that is allied with Western democracies is itself a target of terrorists. Rather, this is an attack by radical fundamentalism, which uses terrorism against the advance of democracy in the world and dialogue among civilizations.

Western democracies find themselves facing an assault by extremist organizations that strike at the innocent and threaten the basic values on which our civilization is founded.

Democratic governments have a daunting task. They must ensure the security of their citizens and guarantee that they can live free from fear.

This is the new frontier of liberty.

Mr. Speaker, I am firmly convinced that in addition to the generous effort by your great country, a grand alliance of all democracies is needed to defend this frontier. It is only by joining the efforts of all the democracies on all continents that we will be able to free the world from the threat of international terrorism, from the fear of aggression by the forces of evil.

The battle to free ourselves from fear is by no means a battle to the exclusive benefit of the citizens who live in a democratic system. It is a battle that benefits above all those who today languish under authoritarian, repressive regimes.

History has shown that the aspiration to democracy is universal and that liberty and democracy are contagious. When people are exposed to the winds of democracy, they inevitably demand respect for their right to freedom from their governments. You are well aware of that because your country is the leading force behind this wind of freedom.

But there is another, equally important reason to forge a common strategy among all democracies.

The United Nations forecasts that over the next 25 years the world's population will increase by another 2 billion people, but a large part of those 2 billion people will be born and will live in countries that today are on the fringes of affluence.

So on the one hand, we will have 6 billion human beings living in destitution; and on the other, fewer than 2 billion living in wealth. Migratory pressures will inevitably soar.

In order to prevent this from happening, and even more, to prevent hunger and desperation from generating hatred and being exploited by fundamentalists, we must raise those countries out of poverty and start them down the road to well-being. It is our moral duty, but it is also in our vital interest. This will only be possible if democracy is allowed to spread and strengthen. All of our efforts must therefore be directed at fostering the development of institutions that ensure good governance, the rule of law, respect for human rights, and free market economies in those countries.

Only democracy can provide liberty, and only liberty can guarantee that individuals will be able to develop their talents, channel their energies, achieve their dreams, and conquer prosperity. The only possible road is to work together to spread democracy.

My government has relentlessly sought to forge a grand alliance of all of the world's democracies. It is for this reason that I lent my vigorous support to President Bush's initiative to establish a U.N. Democracy Fund.

It is for these reasons that I am convinced that the task that lies ahead of us is to promote a culture of respect for human rights and its fundamental freedoms in all countries.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to complete this mission successfully, it is essential that the bonds linking the United States and the European Union remain strong and sound.

It is this belief that prompted me to start a decisive, continuing diplomatic and political initiative with my European colleagues to ensure that the European Union did not weaken its ties to the United States in reaction to the events in Iraq.

For the same reason, we cannot ignore the danger that a united Europe might seek to define its identity in contrast to America. The necessary political and institutional integration of Europe must not mean the creation of a "Fortress Europe," closed to the rest of the world in the belief that in doing so it can preserve its prosperity and liberty.

A conception of European unity founded on a fanciful wish for self-sufficiency would be morally suspect and politically dangerous. Disagreement or, worse, opposition between the United States and Europe would be entirely unjustified and would jeopardize the security and prosperity of the entire world.

The West is and shall remain one. We cannot have two Wests. Europe needs America and America needs Europe. This holds equally true on the political, economic, and military planes.

It is therefore absolutely necessary, indeed fundamental, to sustain and reinvigorate the Atlantic Alliance, the alliance that for more than half a century has guaranteed peace in liberty.

From defense alliance, NATO is gradually becoming a security organization. While defensive alliances are exclusive, created to protect against the threat of other blocs, organizations that protect security must be inclusive, because they become even more effective as the number of member countries increases.

This is why I strongly supported the establishment of the NATO-Russia Council, bringing the Russian Federation into the security architecture of the free world.

I am proud to have worked together with President Bush and President Putin to ensure that this came to pass, and that this momentous decision, which confirmed the Russian Federation's decision to join the West and embrace its values, would be consecrated in Italy, at the historic summit at Pratica di Mare, near Rome.

That day in 2002 marked the end of the nightmare of mutual annihilation by two blocs in arms against each other that had lasted for more than half a century.

NATO must remain the fundamental instrument to guarantee our security. The new European defense capability must therefore be complementary to NATO's. Together, NATO and the European Union shall be democracy's instruments for guaranteeing security in a globalizing world. I have always worked to achieve this objective, which I consider strategic, and will continue to do so.

In this context, the United Nations through a process of reform will have to recover their central role to become more efficient and to be able to tackle the challenges of the new millennium.

Mr. Speaker, our values of democracy and liberty allowed the West to ensure that their peoples enjoy a degree of prosperity unparalleled in the history of humankind. History has shown that

only democracy permits a sound market economy to flourish, because political freedom and economic freedom are but two sides of the same coin.

Nonetheless, we are aware that there are countries that are opening to the market economy, but where authentic democracy does yet not reign and human rights are not adequately respected. The more developed and democratic countries must therefore work with determination to ensure that everywhere the opening to the free market is accompanied by the strengthening of democratic institutions and respect for human rights.

The market economy has always been a powerful drive for countries to transform from autocratic or authoritarian regimes into genuine democracies.

Action to expand the market economy in the world is therefore a key part of our efforts to affirm our values, to affirm liberty for a safer, more prosperous and secure world.

[Spoken in English:]

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, distinguished Members of Congress, the bonds between Americans and Italians are strong and enduring. I am convinced that they will continue to strengthen and that the United States will always find in Italy a partner nation with which it can share the same vision of the world.

Allow me to conclude by sharing with you a brief story. It is the story of a young man, one who had just graduated from high school. His father took him to a cemetery that was the final resting place for brave young soldiers, young people who had crossed an ocean to restore dignity and liberty to an oppressed people. In showing him those crosses, that father made his son vow never to forget the ultimate sacrifice those young American soldiers had made for his freedom. That father made his son vow eternal gratitude to that country.

That father was my father, and that young man was me.

I have never forgotten that sacrifice and that vow, and I never will.

Thank you.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 11 o'clock and 35 minutes a.m., the Prime Minister of the Republic of Italy, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The Members of the President's Cabinet;

The Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

#### JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 11 o'clock and 38 minutes a.m., the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1245

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO) at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

#### PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mrs. KELLY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### THE NEED FOR SMALL BUSINESS TAX RELIEF

(Mrs. KELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. KELLY. Madam Speaker, small businesses are the local engines that drive our national economy, so we must always keep their needs as a centerpiece in our budget priorities in Congress. As we analyze our future budget outlook in the weeks ahead, we need to work together to protect our small businesses.

Yesterday, I met with a group of small business owners from the Warwick Valley Chamber of Commerce back in my district. Hearing them talk about the myriad challenges facing them and their businesses served as a reminder of how critical it is for us to continue providing them the tax relief that they need to continue to create new jobs across our country. We need to extend and make permanent small business tax relief provisions that are critical to our continued economic growth.

We need to continue the increased expensing rules for small businesses, and we should increase the deduction this year to an amount of greater than \$100,000. This Congress has many concerns where it needs to focus on budgetary concerns, but let us not forget the needs of America's small businesses.

The more we do to help small businesses, the more jobs they create for local residents in New York and across the country. Small businesses in America create almost seven out of 10 new jobs. We need to keep those small businesses and the people working.

#### THE REPUBLICAN-DUBAI PORT DEAL

(Mr. STUPAK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Speaker, the United Arab Emirates port deal is nothing new from the Bush administration. Over the past 5 years, President Bush has mastered back-room deals and secrecy, but now his administration's actions are threatening our homeland security. The United Arab Emirates deal was approved by the Bush administration despite national security concerns raised by both the Department of Homeland Security and the United States Coast Guard.

The bipartisan 9/11 Commission has identified America's seaports as particularly vulnerable to attacks because only 6 percent of all cargo containers are screened. The world's busiest port, Hong Kong, can screen 100 percent of their containers. Why can we not do it here at home?

The Bush administration shares responsibility with Republicans here in Congress for the vulnerabilities that now exist at our ports. Democrats listened to the Coast Guard and we listened to the 9/11 Commission, and we tried to increase funding for port security.

House Republicans have opposed these efforts despite the fact the Coast Guard says they need \$4.6 billion over the next 10 years to properly secure our ports.

Madam Speaker, Republican rhetoric on homeland security is not enough. It is time for action. Put Democrats in charge, and we will get 100 percent container inspection, and we will have real port security in this country.

#### AMERICA'S ECONOMY IS BOOMING

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, our economy is booming. I know that may come as a surprise to some of our colleagues across the aisle, and certainly to some of the mainstream media. But our unemployment rate is now at 4.7 percent, and that is lower than the average unemployment rate in the 1970s, the 1980s, and the 1990s. Yes, lower than each of those decades.

And where are the headlines that would praise the smart tax plan that helped to get us there? In January, America created 193,000 new jobs. That is 2 million new jobs in just over the past year.

4.7 million new jobs in the past 30 months. Republicans are not going to play I-told-you-so, but it is pretty obvious that the tax reductions passed in 2003 helped Americans dig out of a recession and get back to work. We will keep on pushing that sort of fair, flatter, simpler tax code that Main Street

America needs to keep creating great jobs.

#### CELEBRATING THE 45TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PEACE CORPS

(Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, 45 years ago today, President Kennedy created the Peace Corps, saying: "It will not be easy. None of the men or women will be paid a salary. They will live at the same level as the citizens of the country to which they are sent, doing the same work, eating the same food, speaking the same language."

On this anniversary, let us celebrate the service of the more than 180,000 brave Americans who have answered President Kennedy's call to service and served our Nation and the world as Peace Corps volunteers.

In 1961, President Kennedy made peace a priority, and peace must remain a priority for our Nation. So for their commitment of hope, friendship and peace, I applaud the nearly 7,800 Americans, including almost 200 Minnesotans who are currently proudly serving as Peace Corps volunteers.

The service of these volunteers and all of the returned Peace Corps volunteers make America proud.

Happy Birthday Peace Corps.

#### AN EASY MATH EQUATION

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss the positive economic news that continues to pour in. These new numbers demonstrate that Republicans' pro-growth economic policies are working.

January's unemployment rate fell to 4.7 percent, which is the lowest monthly rate since 2001, and lower than the average of the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s. There have been 29 consecutive months of job gains. The economy has created over 2 million jobs over the past 12 months.

Real household net worth is at \$51.1 trillion, an all-time high. And finally the Commerce Department just reported that the GDP grew at a 1.6 percent rate in the fourth quarter, up from an original estimate of 1.1 percent.

This encouraging economic news is proof that lower taxes, plus restrained Federal spending, equals economic growth. However, this is a math equation that Democrats just cannot seem to grasp. Perhaps it is because they keep trying to substitute new variables: taxing plus spending will never equal economic growth and prosperity.

However, the Republican formula of lower taxes plus restrained Federal spending will always come out in favor of the American taxpayers and their checkbooks.

### HSA'S WILL CAUSE MORE PROBLEMS THAN THEY SOLVE

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, for 5 years there was a silence at the White House about the issue of health care and how it is deteriorating in this country. The access has gotten worse and worse and worse under this administration.

The other night, in the State of the Union, the President, apparently the polling told him there is a problem out there. So he came out here with another one of his Band-Aids: Let's give everybody a health savings account. A more ridiculous proposal could not have been made on the floor to deal with the problems of average Americans.

To expect average Americans to be able to put aside enough money to pay a \$10,000 deductible and then buy a catastrophic plan is simply not from the real world. The average American in this country is fighting day to day, paycheck to paycheck, and our President comes up with another one of his tax giveaways to the rich.

The only people who benefit from this are wealthy people who can take 10,000 bucks out of their pocket and pay it when it comes due. We ought to stop that and start a debate in this House between the Democrats and Republicans. That is the only way we will get sensible health care coverage for all Americans. They deserve it.

### THE IMPACT OF ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION ON RANCHERS

(Mr. KELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to discuss the impact that illegal immigration has on the ranchers along the Mexican border. I recently spent a week along the Mexican-California border to see firsthand how bad the problem was and what Congress could do to fix it.

I sat down in the living rooms of four different families who own ranches along the border. One couple, Ed and Donna Tisdale, documented on home video 13,000 illegal aliens crossing their property in one year alone.

The Tisdales had their barbed wire fences cut by illegals running off the family's cattle. When their dogs barked to scare off intruders, the dogs were poisoned.

Another rancher told me about numerous break-ins at his home while his family slept, as illegal aliens tried to find food and clothing. One morning his daughters had gone out to feed their pet bunny rabbits, only to find them skinned and taken for food by illegal aliens trying to escape to a nearby highway.

Madam Speaker, the House has recently passed a tough border security

bill. I urge the Senate to act now to address this problem.

### VIEW FROM THE COUNTRY CLUB

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, the view from the country club is great. We have heard a few Republicans waxing poetic about how good the economy is. Jobs, prosperity, happy days are here again. All due to the tax cuts.

There is a real result to the tax cuts. Last year we had the largest deficit in the history of the United States. We borrowed hundreds of billions of dollars and we are going to hand the bill only to people who work for wages and salary, who generally earn less than \$100,000 a year, and to their kids and grandkids.

The wealthy should not pay any portion of that in their version of America because they are the wealth generators. The fourth increase in the national debt since George Bush took office; 60 percent increase in the national debt. That is the result of their tax cut policies.

And wages, they have not budged: 99 percent of the people in America working for wages and salaries saw their real incomes decline last year. One percent did well, those \$300,000 and up, and \$1.3 million and up, they did great. And those are the folks they were having lunch with when they heard how great the economy is in America. I wonder who picked up the tab.

### WELCOMING PRIME MINISTER BERLUSCONI TO THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, the Italian Government has transformed into a vibrant democracy that delivers liberty and opportunity.

While Italy has historically been recognized for its extraordinary beauty and rich culture, today it is respected internationally as a champion of freedom.

Today, Congress is honored to be joined by Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi, a man who has furthered democracy in his country and throughout the world. As an ally in the global war on terrorism, he has led thousands of Italian troops to join American soldiers in stopping the spread of terror in Afghanistan and Iraq, protecting Italian and American families.

As President Bush said yesterday, Prime Minister Berlusconi is a man who keeps his word. His steady friendship demonstrates his strong belief in persistence and international cooperation.

I join my colleagues in welcoming him to the United States Congress.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

### HAPPY ANNIVERSARY PEACE CORPS

(Mr. FARR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I rise today for some very good news. It is news the history of this country's anniversary of the Peace Corps. When I was a college student, I was really impressed that the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, had asked the people of this country to ask what they could do for their country, not what the country could do for them.

And since then, people have been joining the Peace Corps. In fact, 182,000 people have served in the Peace Corps, serving in over 138 countries. Now, why is it so important to celebrate the 45th anniversary of the Peace Corps? Well, in the first case, we just recently heard from General Abizaid, who is the supreme commander in the Middle East, that peace can never be obtained until Americans learn to cross the cultural divide. A very profound statement from a warrior.

I ask those persons in the United States who want to help sustain the peace in this world to join the Peace Corps. It will be the greatest job, hardest job you have ever enjoyed. I did it when I was a young college student. I invite others at any age to join today.

Americans have served as a testament to this country. I hope they will continue for many years.

### PEACE CORPS

(Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOLEY. Madam Speaker, I salute Mr. FARR on his work with the Peace Corps, and I rise too as well to salute that 45th anniversary.

President Kennedy, as was mentioned, started the Peace Corps and asked his brother-in-law, R. Sargent Shriver to command, and appointed him as the first director. As the year progressed, the program continued to grow, sending volunteers to Ghana, Tanzania, Colombia, the Philippines, Chile, and St. Lucia. More than 5,000 applicants took the first exams to enter the Peace Corps. It has grown significantly in numbers.

I recently had the opportunity to meet with a number of volunteers who were currently working in Guatemala and appreciate the hard work that they are doing in the destitute regions of that country. I would also like to salute and commend the following constituents from my district who have been serving in the Peace Corps in those various countries: Benjamin Andrews in South Africa, Megan Chodora

in Moldova, Pat Koester in Thailand, Michael Kreidler in the Ukraine, Merrill Miceli in Kazakhstan, and Patrina Ngo in Kyrgyzstan.

Thanks to those volunteers and the others in our Nation who help make the Peace Corps fulfill its international humanitarian mission. My hat is off to President Kennedy on its 45th anniversary and all of those who have served.

□ 1300

#### HONORING OUR BRAVE VETERANS

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Speaker, last week when we were home I had the occasion to present various medals and awards to veterans in my district. The Fifth Congressional District is home to the highest number of veterans of any Member of Congress. There were medals and awards for those who served in World War II, the Korean War and Vietnam.

We need to stop and pause and certainly thank our veterans from all of those wars, thank them for the freedoms that we, as Americans, enjoy today. Without a doubt, these people came home from being at war, started their lives, built our country into the great country that it is today, and never really asked for anything back from their country. They did not get a lot of the medals that they deserved.

Now that they are getting a little bit older, they are getting perhaps a little sentimental and they wanted to have those medals. We worked with the veterans and got the medals and presented those awards in the majority of the eight counties that I represent.

My hat is off to the veterans of all of the wars and those young men and women currently serving today. We thank them for their bravery.

#### MORATORIUM ON PRIVATE TRAVEL

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, millions of Americans are troubled by recent revelations concerning privately funded travel, and Congress, in my judgment, should ban privately funded travel until a system of prior approval can be established within the framework of the House Ethics Committee.

While private travel permits Members of Congress to expand their knowledge of issues affecting the Nation and the world without burdening taxpayers, recent revelations have served to undermine public confidence about this practice, and I believe it should be suspended until new safeguards can be put in place to ensure accountability and transparency. Congress must take bold action to restore the confidence of the American people in the integrity of our national legislature.

I commend Speaker HASTERT and Chairman DAVID DREIER for offering a bold vision of ethics reform and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting their efforts today.

#### PEACE IN KOSOVO

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, in the State of the Union, the President focused on the need to not only beat the terrorists on their own soil, but to take the offensive in bringing the hope of political freedom and peaceful change to hopeless lands.

I recently had the honor of meeting with our soldiers who are serving in Kosovo and are doing just that. I was glad to be able to thank them for their service and to hear their concerns.

American troops have been keeping the peace in Kosovo, along with our NATO allies, since 1999. We have about 1,700 troops participating in peacekeeping operations in Kosovo, and we must let them know that their service is not forgotten. Their presence brings stability to a troubled region and supports the development of a functioning legal system, the respect for property rights, and the growth of a robust economy.

These pillars will form the foundation of a free and democratic Kosovo, ensuring that our soldiers and their sacrifices will not be in vain.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

#### HONORING JUSTICE SANDRA DAY O'CONNOR

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 357) honoring Justice Sandra Day O'Connor.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 357

Whereas Justice Sandra Day O'Connor was born on March 26, 1930, in El Paso, Texas, and grew up in both El Paso and southeastern Arizona on her family's ranch;

Whereas Justice Sandra Day O'Connor graduated magna cum laude from Stanford University in 1950 with a baccalaureate degree in economics;

Whereas Justice Sandra Day O'Connor graduated from Stanford Law School and was ranked third in a class of 102 graduates;

Whereas Justice Sandra Day O'Connor completed law school in 2 years, instead of

the customary 3, and served on the Stanford Law Review;

Whereas Justice Sandra Day O'Connor entered the public sector after her graduation from Stanford Law School as a deputy county attorney for San Mateo County in California, after she was unable to secure a position in a number of private law firms that employed very few, if any, women as attorneys;

Whereas Justice Sandra Day O'Connor served as Assistant Attorney General of Arizona from 1965 to 1969;

Whereas Justice Sandra Day O'Connor was appointed to the Arizona State Senate in 1969 and was subsequently reelected to 2 2-year terms;

Whereas Justice Sandra Day O'Connor became the State Senate Majority Leader in Arizona in 1973, the first woman to serve in that position in any State;

Whereas Justice Sandra Day O'Connor was elected in 1975 as a judge on the Maricopa County Superior Court in Arizona, and served in that position until 1979;

Whereas Justice Sandra Day O'Connor was appointed to the Arizona Court of Appeals in 1979 and served in that position until her confirmation as an Associate Supreme Court Justice;

Whereas in 1981, President Ronald Reagan nominated Sandra Day O'Connor to be the 102d Supreme Court justice and the first female member of the Supreme Court;

Whereas Sandra Day O'Connor was confirmed by the United States Senate unanimously on September 21, 1981, and took her seat on the Supreme Court on September 25, 1981;

Whereas the elevation of Sandra Day O'Connor as the first female justice of the Supreme Court helped pave the way for more women to enter into the legal profession;

Whereas in 2004, women accounted for approximately half of all students enrolled in law school, compared to 35 percent of law students in 1981 and just 4 percent of law students when Justice O'Connor graduated from Stanford Law School in 1952;

Whereas Justice Sandra Day O'Connor has left a thoughtful and enduring mark on American jurisprudence, which has been molded through her wisdom and strong character; and

Whereas Justice Sandra Day O'Connor blazed new trails for her gender and is a role model for all Americans; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors Justice Sandra Day O'Connor on the occasion of her retirement from the United States Supreme Court;

(2) commends Justice Sandra Day O'Connor for her hard work and dedication to the law; and

(3) recognizes Justice Sandra Day O'Connor as a pioneer for women in law, helping women become a permanent and integral part of the legal profession.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Resolution 357 currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution which commemorates the life and career of former Justice Sandra Day O'Connor upon her retirement from the United States Supreme Court.

Justice O'Connor's 24 years on the Supreme Court capped a distinguished four-decade career of public service. Born in El Paso, Texas, on March 26, 1930, and raised in rural Arizona, O'Connor served on the Law Review at Stanford Law School and took just 2 years to finish the normal 3-year curriculum. She graduated third in a class of 102, which included former Chief Justice of the United States William H. Rehnquist.

Unable to find work at law firms that at the time refused to hire female attorneys, she became a deputy county attorney in San Mateo County, California. This was the first of many public sector jobs Justice O'Connor held throughout her career. She served as the assistant attorney general of Arizona from 1965 to 1969, and then in the Arizona State senate from 1969 to 1975. In 1973, Justice O'Connor became the first woman in any State to become the majority leader of a State senate.

She began her career as a jurist in 1975 when she was elected to become a judge in the Maricopa County Superior Court. She was subsequently appointed to the Arizona Court of Appeals in 1979 and served in that capacity until President Ronald Reagan nominated her to fill the seat of former Justice Potter Stewart on August 19, 1981. The U.S. Senate unanimously confirmed Justice O'Connor on September 21, 1981, and she was sworn in 4 days later, making her the 102nd, and first female, Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

She served a decisive role in crafting the majority opinion in many important cases, but perhaps her greatest accomplishment was in serving as a role model to countless women. Indeed, at the time Justice O'Connor graduated from Stanford Law School, women comprised just 4 percent of all law school students. By 2004, women accounted for approximately half of all students enrolled in law schools.

Throughout her entire career, Justice O'Connor put public service first. Even as she announced her retirement on July 1, 2005, she agreed to serve until the President could nominate and the Senate confirm her replacement.

I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) for introducing this resolution. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting it, and in wishing Justice O'Connor a happy and relaxing retirement with her husband, John.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am very proud to join my colleagues today to honor a woman who not only contributed immensely to American jurisprudence, but also showed tremendous courage and perseverance in finding her way to the top of the legal field at a time when the legal field was virtually closed to women.

Justice Sandra Day O'Connor graduated magna cum laude in 1950 with a bachelor's degree in economics from Stanford University, my alma mater. In just 2 years, instead of the usual 3 years, Justice O'Connor graduated third in her class at Stanford Law School in 1952 at a time, as the chairman has said, when only 4 percent of law school graduates were women.

Despite her impressive law school record and obvious talent, Justice O'Connor could not find a single law firm that would give her a job after graduation, but that did not deter her. She heard that San Mateo County in California, the county just to the north of my home, had once hired a female attorney and so she decided to go there in search of her first legal job, but she learned that there was not enough funding in place or a place in the office for her to work.

That did not deter her. She wrote a long letter explaining why she should be hired and offered to start work for free. She placed her desk in the same area where the secretaries sat. She got the job and before long a paid position opened up and she took it.

Justice O'Connor's perseverance did not end there. She went on to become an assistant attorney general for Arizona. She was appointed and later elected to the Arizona State senate, elected as a county judge, and appointed to the Arizona Court of Appeals.

Justice O'Connor has been a leader for women in many ways. She became the first woman to serve as the majority leader of the Arizona State senate and the first woman to serve on the U.S. Supreme Court, paving the way and opening the door for the next generation of women to substantively participate in the field of law. In fact, I feel, as a lawyer myself, a debt of gratitude to Justice O'Connor for the groundbreaking path that she laid for all of us who followed.

But let us not forget that she was not only a symbol of hope for aspiring women lawyers all around the Nation, but she has also been a powerful contributor to our American jurisprudence, often the pivotal fifth vote on some of the most important issues in modern American history that came before the U.S. Supreme Court.

I strongly urge my colleagues in the House to unanimously approve this resolution honoring this extraordinary woman, and I look forward to a unanimous vote of support by the House of Representatives.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN-WAITE), the author of the resolution.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, today is the first day in which our Nation celebrates the achievements of American women during Women's History Month. Honoring the service of Justice Sandra Day O'Connor is an excellent way to kick off this celebration.

When Justice O'Connor first set out on her journey, the dream of attending law school was not something a woman commonly achieved. Women in her day were encouraged to stay in the home, supporting the men who ran the country. Justice O'Connor's success to find work in the law profession exemplifies the determination that she had to achieve greatness. By defying society restrictions, today she offers great hope to the women of every generation.

Justice O'Connor is an inspiration to women across the Nation. She won acclaim as the first woman to be appointed to the United States Supreme Court and her retirement marks the end of an era.

During her service of 25 years on the Court, Justice O'Connor established a reputation as a key decision maker. By sticking to her philosophy of drawing practical conclusions when determining her final decision, she would often cast the deciding vote. Widely known as one of the most influential women in the United States, this title is often attributed to the dynamic Justice O'Connor brought to the United States Supreme Court.

Madam Speaker, little girls and young women take for granted today what women such as Justice O'Connor accomplished in earlier generations. As cochair of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues, I am honored to have offered this resolution today to remind us all, both men and women, to remain true to our beliefs and question the obstacles that others have put in place.

I am privileged to have witnessed the work of Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, and I look forward to supporting House Resolution 357 this afternoon. I certainly appreciate the Judiciary Committee and our awesome chairman for allowing this to be put on the agenda and that we have it on the floor before us today.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT).

(Mrs. SCHMIDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 357, honoring former United States Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor and commend my colleague from Florida, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE, for her

work on this legislation and Chairman SENSENBRENNER for allowing this to go through.

□ 1315

In 1981, when Sandra Day O'Connor was unanimously confirmed to the seat previously held by my fellow Cincinnati, Justice Potter Stewart, as the first woman Justice, it was a very different time in America. After 24 years serving our Nation, it can be said that her legacy is multifaceted: one of the most influential Justices in history; certainly one of the most powerful women in America; and a pioneer in every sense of the word.

We know she was born in El Paso to parents who owned a 198,000-acre cattle ranch in southeastern Arizona. There she learned roping and riding but also the self-reliance and determination that influenced her life. Despite her many achievements at Stanford and Stanford Law School, law review, graduating in 2 years instead of three, and third in her class of 120, no law firm would hire her because she was a woman. She turned to public service and was Arizona's assistant attorney general, the first woman majority leader of the State senate, a trial judge and an Arizona court of appeals judge before being named to the United States Supreme Court. Maybe it is good no law firm would hire her.

Although I have not always agreed with her on every decision, Justice O'Connor stood for federalism, pragmatism, compromise and interpreting, not legislating, the law. She considered each case individually on its own merits. Her hallmarks of integrity, diligence, and fairness have been woven through every task she has undertaken.

Balancing the demands of a career and family, Justice O'Connor set a positive example for women, especially young women. She once said, "Society as a whole benefits immeasurably from a climate in which all persons, regardless of race or gender, may have the opportunity to earn respect, responsibility, advancement and remuneration based on ability."

During Women's History Month, it is especially fitting that we honor her.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bill introduced by the gentlelady from Florida. As a member of the Congressional Women's Caucus, I applaud Justice Sandra Day O'Connor for her leadership as the first woman to serve on the U.S. Supreme Court.

Appointment of Justice O'Connor added life to the women's movement, and when Justice Ginsburg was appointed, we had 2 very strong allies when these matters came before the high court. Her judicious leadership stood out when she joined Justices Souter and Kennedy in crafting a compromise to uphold *Roe v. Wade* in the *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* decision—that included the standard of limiting state regulation of abortions to the threshold of causing an "undue burden" on a woman's right to choose.

Justice O'Connor helped to protect affirmative action by making the swing vote in the 5-

to-4 decision of *Grutter v. Bollinger*. This decision was a landmark that still has precedential value in terms of preserving the notion that there is not only the right to due process in the law at stake but the value of racial diversity in education.

Most recently, though, many of us on both sides of the aisle commend Justice O'Connor for her dissent in the recent Supreme Court decision of *Kelo v. City of New London et. al* (No. 04–108. Argued February 22, 2005—Decided June 23, 2005), in which she stated that

[a]ny property may now be taken for the benefit of another private party, but the fall-out from this decision will not be random. The beneficiaries are likely to be those citizens with disproportionate influence and power in the political process, including large corporations and development firms . . . [t]he Founders cannot have intended this perverse result. "[T]hat alone is a just government," wrote James Madison, "which impartially secures to every man, whatever is his own."

I hope that the Court will continue this kind of sound judgment and leadership on matters of such great significance to our disadvantaged communities.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation, and I thank Justice O'Connor for her service to our Highest Court.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, which honors the career of one of this Nation's most respected jurists, Associate Justice Sandra Day O'Connor. Not only did Justice O'Connor leave an indelible impression on the law but also on the legal profession itself.

As an Associate Justice, Mrs. O'Connor had a well-deserved reputation for being the swing vote on seminal cases. From campaign finance laws to affirmative action and sexual orientation discrimination, many Supreme Court lawyers tailored their arguments to her because of her ability and willingness to see the complexity of the issues that came before the court.

She also left her mark on the diversity of the legal profession. When she graduated from law school in 1952, ranked no less than 3rd in her class of 102 students, gender discrimination kept her from jobs at law firms. This was a time when women comprised only 4 percent of law graduates. Instead, she turned to public service and embarked upon a stellar career as a State prosecutor, State legislator, and State judge.

It was in her capacity as an Arizona Court of Appeals judge in 1981 that Justice O'Connor came to the attention of the White House. President Reagan nominated her to fill the seat of Justice Potter Stewart. On September 21, 1981, the Senate unanimously confirmed her to be the 102d Justice of the Supreme Court and the 1st female justice in history.

With Justice O'Connor as an example, the ranks of female lawyers have grown tremendously in this country. In 1981, the year of her appointment, women made up 35 percent of law students. In 2004, they made up approximately 50 percent. It would be impossible to overstate Justice O'Connor's role in that achievement. I thank her for her service to our country and wish her the best.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this resolution.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the resolution honoring Justice Sandra Day O'Connor.

Justice O'Connor served as a role model at a time when very few women were pursuing legal careers. Even before she was appointed to the United States Supreme Court, Justice O'Connor's career was one to follow. She served as a government lawyer, general practitioner, agency attorney, state legislator, and a judge at both the trial and appellate levels.

As the first woman ever to serve on the U.S. Supreme Court, Justice O'Connor was a steady—albeit unpredictable—presence on the bench. She was incredibly thoughtful and deliberate with her decisions, evaluating every case on its merits.

Justice O'Connor earned her place in history, making a permanent mark on the judicial system that will forever inspire girls and women throughout America. She will be greatly missed.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 357, honoring fellow Texan and former Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor. As the first woman inducted into the Supreme Court, Sandra Day O'Connor broke through gender barriers and a glass ceiling that had existed for almost two centuries.

Her outstanding service to America and the Supreme Court serves as a role model not only to women, but to anyone who was told they couldn't do a job based on bias and negative perception. Throughout her life, Justice O'Connor continually rose above prejudice—forming her own law firm when no one would hire her, and becoming the first woman to hold the position of majority leader in the Arizona State Senate.

Sandra Day O'Connor became one of the most powerful women in U.S. History. Instead of rebelling against a male-dominated society, Justice O'Connor sought to change the world by working within the system. Her decisions on controversial cases such as abortion, affirmative action, the death penalty, and religious freedom have changed the American landscape and will continue to impact us far into the future.

I commend Justice O'Connor for her years of service and for serving as a role model for so many Americans.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 357, Honoring Justice Sandra Day O'Connor. Honoring Justice O'Connor's career as a jurist with this resolution is significant as she was a pioneer for women in the legal profession.

Nominated for the Supreme Court by President Reagan and confirmed by the U.S. Senate in 1981, Justice O'Connor became the 102nd Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, and its first woman member. Justice O'Connor served honorably until her retirement on January 31, 2006. Justice O'Connor retired from the bench and from public service with the same grace and dignity with which she served. Her commitment to the Constitution, to public service, and to the United States will serve as inspiration for young Americans for years to come. Her work while on the Court will continue to provide needed guidance as American law continues to evolve. Her legacy of attacking bias not only against women but against all groups through jurisprudence benefits us all.

Justice O'Connor is the product of humble beginnings. In school, Justice O'Connor worked hard, earning numerous achievements while overcoming many obstacles in her path

to success. Upon graduation, Justice O'Connor found it difficult to obtain a position with any law firm due to her gender despite having earned honors as an undergraduate and a law student at Stanford University. Undaunted, she created her own opportunities, partnering with a colleague and beginning her own firm. Shortly thereafter, Justice O'Connor placed her career on hold to become a mother. During this time, Justice O'Connor devoted herself to volunteer activities with the Arizona State Hospital, the Arizona State Bar, the Salvation Army and several local schools.

Justice O'Connor returned to practicing law after 5 years as a full-time mother and assumed a position with the Arizona Attorney General's office. In 1969, she was appointed to fill a vacancy in the Arizona State Senate and 4 years later was the first woman to serve as the chamber's majority leader. This leadership role, however, only marked the beginning of her groundbreaking professional accomplishments.

In 1974, Justice O'Connor was nominated for a judgeship position in the Maricopa County Superior Court and nominated to the Arizona Court of Appeals 5 years later. As a result of her work on the Arizona Court of Appeals President Reagan nominated her to serve on the Supreme Court. Justice O'Connor's career proves that there is no barrier to large, no challenge to great, and no position to lofty to attain for a woman of integrity, conviction and intelligence.

Justice O'Connor is among the pioneering women of our time. She stands as a testament to what a fearless spirit, a determined heart and a sharp mind can achieve in the face of bias and tradition. Today, only one woman now serves on the Supreme Court, but we now that more will follow in the footsteps of Justice O'Connor.

Although Justice O'Connor is most widely recognized for her 24 years as an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, she deserves to be recognized for leading a life of humanity, of dedication to public service, and one of commitment to making our country more fair, tolerant, and a better place to live. Her lifetime of achievements in the field of law and public service will always be remembered. Our country thanks her for the example she has set.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 357.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

# HONORING AND PRAISING THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 97TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 335) honoring and praising the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its 97th anniversary.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 335

Whereas the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), originally known as the National Negro Committee, was founded in New York City on February 12, 1909, the centennial of Abraham Lincoln's birth, by a multiracial group of activists who answered "The Call" for a national conference to discuss the civil and political rights of African Americans;

Whereas the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People was founded by a distinguished group of leaders in the struggle for civil and political liberty, including Ida Wells-Barnett, W.E.B. DuBois, Henry Moscowitz, Mary White Ovington, Oswald Garrison Villiard, and William English Walling;

Whereas the NAACP is the oldest and largest civil rights organization in the United States;

Whereas the mission of the NAACP is to ensure the political, educational, social, and economic equality of rights of all persons and to eliminate racial hatred and racial discrimination;

Whereas the NAACP is committed to achieving its goals through nonviolence;

Whereas the NAACP advances its mission through reliance upon the press, the petition, the ballot, and the courts, and has been persistent in the use of legal and moral persuasion, even in the face of overt and violent racial hostility;

Whereas the NAACP has used political pressure, marches, demonstrations, and effective lobbying to serve the voice, as well as the shield, for minority Americans;

Whereas after years of fighting segregation in public schools, the NAACP, under the leadership of Special Counsel Thurgood Marshall, won one of its greatest legal victories in the Supreme Court's 1954 decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*;

Whereas in 1955, NAACP member Rosa Parks was arrested and fined for refusing to give up her seat on a segregated bus in Montgomery, Alabama—an act of courage that would serve as the catalyst for the largest grassroots civil rights movement in the history of the United States;

Whereas the NAACP was prominent in lobbying for the passage of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and the Fair Housing Act, laws which ensured Government protection for legal victories achieved; and

Whereas in 2005, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People launched the Disaster Relief Fund to help survivors in Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, Florida, and Alabama to rebuild their lives: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—*

(1) recognizes the 97th anniversary of the historic founding of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; and

(2) honors and praises the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its anniversary for its work to ensure the political, educational, social, and economic equality of all persons.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Concurrent Resolution 335 currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 335, a resolution honoring the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its 97th anniversary.

This resolution recognizes that the NAACP has played an important role in helping to ensure that our constitutional guarantees are extended to all citizens.

Founded on the centennial of Republican President and Great Emancipator Abraham Lincoln's birthday in 1909, the NAACP represents America's oldest civil rights organization. Through members such as Rosa Parks, who ignited the national civil rights movement, and former Justice Thurgood Marshall, whose leadership led to the landmark legal victory in *Brown v. Board of Education*, the NAACP has helped galvanize efforts to promote the promise of equality that our Constitution envisioned.

Through nonviolent means, the NAACP led the Nation's effort to seek passage of the 1957, 1960, 1964, and 1968 civil rights acts. Challenging Federal, State, and local officials and governments to accord equal legal treatment to all citizens, the NAACP has sought to promote racial equality in areas such as education, employment, housing, and public facilities.

In 1965, the NAACP led the movement to seek passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, one of the most significant pieces of legislation passed during the 20th century. Committed to extending the protections of the 15th amendment and the Voting Rights Act to all African Americans, the NAACP worked tirelessly to register tens of thousands of new voters despite threats of violence. The NAACP has helped advance each reauthorization effort, including in 1982, when I was privileged to lead that bipartisan effort with my Democratic colleagues. I will lead that bipartisan effort with my Democratic colleagues again this spring when the Voting Rights Act is once again renewed.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution to recognize the NAACP for

their contributions toward equality in America.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin. I especially thank him for his kind words with reference to the NAACP and his indication that he will lead the charge, in fact be a part of the avant garde, with reference to extending the Voting Rights Act. I thank you for this.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored that the House leadership has chosen to bring House Concurrent Resolution 335 before this august body. This resolution honors the 97th anniversary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; and as I rise to the occasion, I would like to thank those who have made the occasion possible.

First, I would like to thank Chairman SENSENBRENNER, chairman of the powerful Judiciary Committee. He has spoken eloquently. I thank you for your kind words again; and I also want to, for the record, say you did what you did not have to do, and for this, I thank you.

I would like to thank ranking member JOHN CONYERS, who is now the dean of the conscience of the Congress. I thank you for helping us to bring this piece of legislation to the floor of the House.

I would also like to take an opportunity and thank my good friend Congressman HENRY HYDE, who was the first to sign on to this resolution. He gave his word, and I have learned that HENRY HYDE's word is his bond; and I thank Mr. HYDE.

Finally, my heartfelt thanks go out to all 67 of my colleagues who cosponsored this resolution, as well as all who will support it, both Democrats and Republicans alike.

Mr. Speaker, because I do not know where we would be but for the NAACP, I cannot help but say thank God for the NAACP and the many other persons of goodwill who have fought racial injustice, because, Mr. Speaker, in our lifetime we can recall a time when racial injustice, as someone has said, was accepted by the masses and expected by the classes.

It was commonplace. It was every place. Politicians campaigned on it; judges decreed it; lawyers practiced it; policemen enforced it; preachers preached it; parents believed it; teachers taught it; and children learned it. We were all consumed by it.

However, the NAACP and others of goodwill helped to change this, and I am honored to say that this change has brought about significant progress in this country for African Americans and other minorities.

Hence, it is desired that this resolution not only honor the NAACP as an entity, but also the entire NAACP family and extended family, including the

many people of goodwill who were not black, who put themselves in harm's way to end racial injustice.

We should never forget that the NAACP has not been, is not now, and never shall be a black-only organization. The NAACP has always been a multiracial organization. Yes, in remembering some of the great names associated with the organization, we should remember that Dr. Louis T. Wright became the first black board chair of the NAACP in 1935. However, as we remember Dr. Wright, we ought not forget Oswald Garrison Villiard who was not black, who in 1911 became the first chair of the board of the NAACP. Before the NAACP had its first black board chair, it had two that were not black.

We should remember James Weldon Johnson, who became the first black executive secretary director of the NAACP. However, we should not forget Francis Blascon, Mary White Ovington, Mary Nurney, Royall Nash. All of these persons we might remember were not black and served before James Weldon Johnson.

We should remember the brilliant black lawyer and Supreme Court Justice, as the chairman has mentioned, Thurgood Marshall. However, we should never forget Arthur Singarn who was not black. Arthur Singarn donated money, he raised money, and he headed the NAACP Legal Redress Committee. It has been said that Thurgood was a great litigator in part because Singarn was a great donator. The NAACP annually awards its highest honor in the name of Singarn.

We should remember Medgar Evers, the black NAACP field representative who was assassinated in his front yard in 1963; but, please, let us not forget John R. Shillady, the NAACP executive secretary who never recovered from a mob beating in Austin, Texas, in 1919. He gave his life in the fight for justice for all, and he was not black.

The point is, we did not get here by ourselves; and we thank God for the many who were not black who helped us in our quest for justice.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman who I have announced earlier is the conscience of the Congress and that, of course, is Congressman CONYERS. We thank you for being with us, Congressman.

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONYERS. Thank you, Mr. GREEN, for yielding just briefly to add to your remarks. I am pleased to join with you and with the chairman of Judiciary, JAMES SENSENBRENNER, in this 97th anniversary remembrance of the greatest civil rights organization that we have in this country. I can say to Congressman GREEN that your initiation of this resolution recognizing the 97th anniversary of the NAACP could not be more timely.

I just want to add one name. We are all mentioning all of these names in

the course of 97 years. We are dealing with the most serious social problem in America that has never yet been resolved that we have been working on. We have a voter rights extension bill in the Committee on the Judiciary about to come forward.

□ 1330

We are bringing people together. We are working as hard as we can.

And I was just at a meeting yesterday in which I was reminded that we have the likes of Ted Shaw of the Legal Defense Fund; Greg Moore, the executive director of the National Voter Fund; and in Detroit we have the largest branch in the United States, with a current membership of more than 45,000 people, led by Reverend Wendell Anthony of Fellowship Chapel. So all of this makes such a rich history.

And I am glad, now that we have done Black History Month, that we have come along with this 97th anniversary resolution, because this issue has to be studied every month. We have to examine where we are and where we are going. And I am so pleased at all the Members on the floor here and many others that will be submitting statements which recognize the depth, the importance and the significance of a resolution recognizing nearly 100 years of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in this long struggle, hard-fought struggle that has promoted goodwill and tried to make America live up to the promise of our constitutional democracy.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his leadership and for the leadership of Chairman SENSENBRENNER, and to all who celebrate the 97th anniversary of the NAACP.

Mr. GREEN earlier said that there were so many people who gave their lives, gave their blood, sweat and tears, and he mentioned Medgar Evers. But I just want to talk about another member of the NAACP, and his name was Harry Moore. He was a devoted husband, father, educator, and one of the first civil rights martyrs of our time. His tireless efforts and unselfish sacrifice in the name of social justice continues to inspire and empower Americans of all stripes, even now, over 50 years after his death.

Harry Tyson Moore was born in Houston, Florida, on November 18, 1905. After his father's death, his mother sent her only son to live with his three aunts in Jacksonville, Florida. In the prosperous and intellectual community of Jacksonville, Mr. Moore cultivated his intelligence and excelled. After graduating from Florida Memorial College in 1925, he moved to Cocoa, Florida. He settled in Brevard County teaching fourth grade at the only African American elementary school in the area.

While there, he went on to meet his future wife, Harriette Simms. In time,

Mr. Moore became principal of the Titusville Colored School, which taught children from the fourth to ninth grade. In March 1928 and September 1930, the Moores welcomed two daughters into the world. With his family and professional life in place, Mr. Moore began an additional career in political activism.

In 1934, Mr. Moore founded the Brevard County branch of the NAACP. In 1937, by working with the Black Florida State Teachers Association and NAACP attorney Thurgood Marshall, he was a catalyst towards the movement of equalizing salaries of black and white teachers. Although he lost the court battle, he would ultimately win the war. Make no mistake, his actions inspired many others, and ultimately Mr. Moore helped achieve pay parity among teachers of color with their white counterparts.

I wish I had time to tell the entire story, but on one Christmas Eve Mr. Moore and his family were blown to pieces because of his work in the NAACP.

So many people never hear the name Harry Moore, but he was another tireless fighter, lifting up the rights for all people, and he is one of the people who make it possible for the Congressional Black Caucus today to number some 43.

I thank the NAACP on its 97th anniversary and I urge all Members to support this resolution.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for one final statement.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I would like to restate to a certain extent some of what the chairman has said: that the NAACP has accomplished great things for this country. The NAACP was involved in passing the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964. The NAACP was there to fight and help pass the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Fair Housing Act of 1968, and the NAACP filed and won *Shelly v. Cramer*, as well as *Barrows v. Jackson*, outlawing restrictive covenants. The NAACP filed and won *Brown v. Board of Education*, integrating schools and, to a certain extent, integrating society.

And, Mr. Speaker, if truth be told, we are schooled where we are schooled, we work where we work, we sleep where we sleep, we eat where we eat, and we live where we live in great measure due to the NAACP.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, last summer, I was honored to be invited to address the NAACP convention, which was held in Milwaukee, and I got a very good reception in talking about reauthorizing the Voting Rights Act, which my committee will be dealing with shortly, as well as overturning the Supreme Court's erroneous decision in the case of *Kelo v. City of New London*, Connecticut, which basically said that

there were no constitutional protections against a municipality using eminent domain to take a person's private property simply because the city fathers and mothers decided that there would be a way to get more tax revenue out of that piece of land.

That bill has passed the House of Representatives and is currently pending in the other body, and I hope we can have eminent domain reform passed during this session of Congress, as well as the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion at this point in the RECORD the speech that I gave to the NAACP convention in Milwaukee on July 10, 2005.

Good evening. Thank you for this opportunity to talk briefly about two important issues facing us right now: an extension of the Voting Rights Act and the Supreme Court's recent 5-4 decision in the *Kelo* case, which held that the government can use "economic development" as a reason for taking private property.

Among my proudest moments was accompanying members of the NAACP and Dr. Marsha Coleman-Adebayo for the signing of the No FEAR Act, legislation that aims to stamp out discrimination in federal agencies. The bipartisan passage of No FEAR, the first civil rights legislation of the 21st century, should serve as a model for future civil rights bills.

On August 5, 2005, the United States will celebrate the 40th anniversary of one of the most significant pieces of legislation enacted during the 20th Century—the Voting Rights Act. This profound legislation pushed back against those unwilling to treat all citizens as equals and restored the dignity and equality that our Constitution is intended to preserve for all citizens.

Our democratic system of government has as its most fundamental right the right of its citizens to participate in the political process. Adopted 135 years ago, the 15th Amendment ensures that no American citizen's right to vote can be denied or abridged by the United States or a State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. As far too many here know and have experienced, some government entities have not only been unfaithful to the rights and protections afforded by the Constitution, but have aggressively—and sometimes violently—tried to disenfranchise African-American and other minority voters.

In his momentous speech delivered to Congress on March 15, 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson stated, "[e]xperience has clearly shown that the existing process of law cannot overcome systematic and ingenious discrimination. No law that we now have on the books—and I have helped to put three of them there—can ensure the right to vote when local officials are determined to deny it. In such a case our duty must be clear to all of us. The Constitution says that no person shall be kept from voting because of his race or color. We have all sworn an oath before God to support and to defend that Constitution. We must now act in obedience to that oath."

Seeing the Voting Rights Act's impact compelled me in 1982 to lead the House Republican effort to extend it for 25 years. This effort wasn't easy—but then again, very important things never are. While I proudly display in my Washington office one of the pens President Ronald Reagan used to sign this extension, the fruits of this effort can best be seen on the faces of those not only participating in the political process but actively leading it.

In the 1960s, all major civil rights legislation was passed with strong bipartisan support. Lately, this has not been the case as some have tried to use the issue of civil rights to obtain a partisan advantage. This is both wrong and shortsighted. The stakes have not been higher in the past 20 years.

In 2007, several key protections contained in the Voting Rights Act will expire, including the federal oversight protections provided by Section 5. I am here to tell you publicly what I have told others privately, including the head of the Congressional Black Caucus, Representative Mel Watt—during this Congress we are going to extend the Voting Rights Act. I am not alone in the Congress in supporting an extension; indeed, House Speaker Dennis Hastert last week stated that reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act is high on his list of issues the House will address this Congress.

Soon I will be introducing legislation to extend the Voting Rights Act. Just like its enactment and its 1982 extension, this bipartisan effort will succeed. Ladies and gentlemen, while we have made progress and curtailed injustices thanks to the Voting Rights Act, our work is not yet complete. We cannot let discriminatory practices of the past resurface to threaten future gains. The Voting Rights Act must continue to exist—and exist in its current form.

I also want to mention my strong opposition to the Supreme Court's recent 5-4 decision in the *Kelo* case, which held that the government can use "economic development" as a reason for taking private property from one small homeowner and giving it to a large corporation simply because the corporation's greater wealth will bring the government more tax revenue.

As the NAACP so correctly noted in its brief filed with the Supreme Court in the *Kelo* case, "The takings that result [from the Court's decision] will disproportionately affect and harm the economically disadvantaged and, in particular, racial and ethnic minorities and the elderly."

The noxious practice endorsed by the Court's *Kelo* decision has generated bipartisan opposition. Last week, I introduced H.R. 3135, the "Private Property Rights Protection Act of 2005," with the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. Conyers, as the lead Democratic cosponsor, and Representatives Maxine Waters, Sheila Jackson-Lee, and 87 additional Members as original cosponsors.

This legislation would prevent the Federal government from using economic development as a justification for taking privately-owned property. It would also prohibit any State or municipality from doing so whenever Federal funds are involved with the project for which the government's takings power is exercised.

American taxpayers should not be forced to contribute in any way to the abuse of government power. One man's home must not become a hotel or strip mall solely because the government seeks more tax revenue. I am looking forward to working with you and all organizations opposed to the Supreme Court's *Kelo* decision. We must ensure that churches, homes, farms, and other private property cannot be bulldozed in abusive land grabs that benefit other private individuals, who claim that their use of the land will increase tax revenues.

Last week, America celebrated the 229th anniversary of her independence. Let us all work towards the day—envisioned by our Founders and affirmed by Frederick Douglass—in which the rich inheritance of justice, liberty, prosperity, and independence bequeathed by our Founders is shared by all Americans.

Ladies and gentlemen, I look forward to continuing to work together and thank you for this opportunity to address you.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, as our Nation recognizes and celebrates the 97th Anniversary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, NAACP, I rise today to pay homage to the momentous contributions of the organization to our nation. In so doing, I would like to highlight the life and legacy of one of its most impressive, but relatively unknown leaders, Harry T. Moore.

Harry T. Moore was one of the first civil rights martyrs of our time. A devoted husband, father, educator, his tireless efforts and unselfish sacrifice in the name of social justice continue to inspire and empower Americans of all stripes, even now, over 50 years after his death.

Harry Tyson Moore was born in Houston, Florida on November 18, 1905. After his father's death his mother sent her only son to live with his three aunts in Jacksonville, Florida. In the prosperous and intellectual community of Jacksonville, Mr. Moore cultivated his intelligence and excelled. After graduating from Florida Memorial College in 1925, he moved to Cocoa, Florida. He settled in Brevard County teaching fourth grade at the only African-American elementary school in the area.

While there, he went on to meet his future wife, Harriette Vyda Simms. In time, Mr. Moore became principal of the Titusville Colored School, which taught children from the fourth to ninth grade. In March 1928 and September 1930, the Moore's welcomed two daughters into the world. With his family and professional life in place, Mr. Moore began an additional career in political activism.

In 1934, Mr. Moore founded the Brevard County NAACP chapter. In 1937, by working with the Black Florida State Teacher's Association and NAACP attorney Thurgood Marshall, he catalyzed a movement to equalize the salaries of Black and White teachers. Although he lost the court battle, he would ultimately win the war. Make no mistake, his actions inspired many others and ultimately, Mr. Moore helped achieve pay parity among teachers of color and their White counterparts.

In 1941, he organized the Florida State Conference of the NAACP and worked as an executive secretary without compensation. His platform also broadened as he began to add his voice to issues such as Black voting disenfranchisement, segregated education, and later in 1943, lynchings and police brutality. He began to organize protests, and write and circulate letters voicing his concerns about the issues.

He also organized the Progressive Voter's League and with his persistence and diligence, in 1948, helped over 116,000 Black voters register, which represented 31 percent of the African-American voting population in the Florida Democratic Party. In 1946, due to his role in the League, Mr. Moore and his wife were terminated from their jobs. Mr. Moore then took on a full-time paid position as an organizer for the NAACP. However, in 1949, over Mr. Moore's objection, the national NAACP office raised the dues from \$1 to \$2, causing a substantial amount of members to revoke their membership. This marked only the beginning of a strained relationship between Mr. Moore and the national NAACP office.

During that same year, the landmark Groveland rape case occurred, in which four African-American men were falsely accused of raping

a White woman. Although the men were brutally beaten and no evidence suggested that the woman was raped, one of the men was killed, one was given a life sentence, and the other two were sentenced to death.

With Mr. Moore's assistance in conjunction with the legal counsel of the NAACP, the case went to the U.S. Supreme Court and the conviction for the two sentenced to death was overturned. However, Sheriff Willis McCall, a known White supremacist, shot the two men to death as he was driving them to their pre-trial hearing. Recognizing this tragic injustice, Mr. Moore vigorously advocated for the indictment of Sheriff McCall.

Sadly, Mr. Moore never lived to see the outcome of his work in this case. On the eve of his 25th wedding anniversary and Christmas Day 1951, Mr. Moore and his wife were killed when a bomb placed underneath their bed in the floor detonated. Mr. Moore died in his mother's arms on the way to the hospital while Harriet died only nine days later.

Following the Moores' murder, there was a public outcry in the African-American community. Despite massive amounts of mail sent to President Truman and the Florida Governor in protest and the many protests and memorials organized demanding justice, no arrests were made in relation to the horrendous crime.

In no uncertain terms, Harry T. Moore led without permission, without acknowledgment, and without fear. What made his vision so tangible was the fact that he believed he could achieve what he set before himself. In a speech his daughter gave in 2002, she stated, "Daddy started the movement. He had absolutely nobody but us, and yet he accomplished all of those things—the voting, the teacher salaries all of the lynchings that he investigated. That's a very important part of history."

Mr. Speaker, Harry T. Moore's story is one of such importance as we celebrate the 97th anniversary of the NAACP and reflect on the success of its past and present leaders. Although the victories achieved by the organization are historic, it should be understood that ordinary people by the tens of thousands won our freedom.

For 97 years, the multi-racial membership of the NAACP—ordinary people called to an extraordinary mission—have marched, demonstrated and lobbied for justice in a movement for peaceful change felt in every aspect of American life.

That is why we must celebrate and praise the NAACP and recall these stories. For these stories are not only told to recall the achievements of African-American trailblazers, but to offer the next Harry T. Moore, W.E.B. DuBois, Ida Wells-Barnett, and Lena K. Lee the hope, promise, direction, and purpose needed to rise from the ordinary to achieve the extraordinary.

I shall conclude with an excerpt of the heartfelt words written by Langston Hughes in memory of Harry T. Moore: In his heart is only love For all the human race, And all he wants is for every man To have his rightful place. And this he says, our Harry Moore, As from the grave he cries: No bomb can kill the dreams I hold For freedom never dies!

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 335 and to thank my colleague, Mr. GREEN, for introducing this resolution. It is important for all of us to honor the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its 97th anniversary for the many achievements that highlight their long and distinguished history.

As a native of Baltimore and a lifetime member of the NAACP, this resolution holds special importance for me. The NAACP has been headquartered in Baltimore since 1986, continuing a long tradition of civil rights prominence for the city. Thurgood Marshall, also a son of Baltimore, was one of the NAACP's premier advocates and later our nation's first African American Justice.

Founded in February 1909 by members of the Niagara Movement, the NAACP has been a catalyst for America's evolution. Its founding members included Ida Wells-Barnett, Henry Moscowitz, and William Edward Burghardt DuBois. Their heroic efforts formed the foundation that helped spark the Civil Rights Movement. They and future generations confronted daily the evils of Jim Crow, and challenged more subtle but equally pernicious forms of racial discrimination. The NAACP has led efforts to construct a society based on equality, respect, and understanding between all citizens. Its legislative accomplishments are legendary—the 1957 Civil Rights Act, the Civil Rights Act of 1960 and 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and the 1968 Fair Housing Rights Act among them.

Over the years, the list of NAACP pioneers has included Walter White, Charles Hamilton Houston, Rosa Parks, Medgar Evers, Elaine Jones, and many thousands of other brave freedom fighters. The NAACP challenged school segregation in *Brown v. Board of Education* and residential segregation in *Buchanan v. Warley*. It fought segregation in government institutions, resulting in its eventual repeal. It defeated Supreme Court nominations of those who would deny equal rights. It mobilized voters in the South at a time when the very lives of their volunteers were threatened. And it continues to shine a beacon of light for equal justice.

But the NAACP represents so much more than these landmark laws and court decisions; it represents a voice for change, a clarion call to end the vicious and destructive stereotypes that too often still divide rather than unite our country; and a vehicle for raising of the collective consciousness of America.

Current President and CEO Bruce Gordon leads a strong and vibrant association of more than half a million members, with seven regional offices and hundreds of local branches, united in purpose.

For nearly a century, the NAACP has set the standard for effecting meaningful social change. I am proud to congratulate the NAACP on this 97th anniversary, I look forward to its centennial, and I urge my colleagues to unanimously support this resolution.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to recognize the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on its 97th anniversary. The NAACP holds a very special meaning to me. One honor I especially treasure is being named Virginia's first individual Golden Heritage Life Member. That honor was a great addition to the honor of having served as president of the Newport News chapter. The NAACP also holds a special place in the collective memory of all of our people.

The NAACP is an organization that has made a difference from the very beginning. In 1909, 60 prominent Americans, including Ida B. Wells-Barnett and W.E.B. DuBois, met on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the

birth of Abraham Lincoln to discuss racial violence and social justice. Out of that meeting, the NAACP was born—with the goal of securing rights, liberties and protections for all Americans, as guaranteed by the Constitution.

The NAACP has always fought against injustices by using nonviolent protests, the press, the ballot, and the courts. The NAACP took on the President of the United States in 1918 and President Wilson finally publicly condemned lynching. During World War I, the NAACP successfully campaigned for African Americans to be commissioned as officers in the army. And in World War II, the NAACP pressured Roosevelt into ordering a non-discriminatory policy in war-related industries and Federal employment.

In 1946, the NAACP won the *Morgan v. Virginia* case where the Supreme Court banned states from having segregated facilities on buses and trains that crossed state borders. And in 1948, the NAACP pressured President Truman into signing the Executive Order that banned discrimination in the armed forces. In 1954, the NAACP won its landmark legal case—*Brown v. the Board of Education*—declaring “separate and equal” unconstitutional.

Through the 50s and 60s protests made a lot of difference. In 1955, NAACP member Rosa Parks was arrested and fined for refusing to give up her seat on a segregated bus in Montgomery, Alabama. This led to the Montgomery bus boycott, which led to the emergence of Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. All of these events led to the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the 1965 Voting Rights Act, President Johnson’s 1965 Executive Order banning employment discrimination in Federal contracts, the 1968 Fair Housing Act, and other landmark civil rights reforms.

The NAACP is what the late Bishop Stephen Gill Spotswood, a former National Board Chairman, has called “the oldest, largest, most effective, most consulted, most militant, most feared and most loved of all civil rights organizations in the world.” Bishop Spotswood’s statement remains true today.

In the 21st Century, the NAACP is needed as much as ever to make a difference—at all levels—National, State and local. Despite victories won long ago we are still facing challenges. In its 97th year, the NAACP needs to continue its great legacy of contribution and commitment to ensure that these hard-won civil rights will always be protected. Congratulations on your 97th anniversary.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 335, legislation that recognizes the 97th anniversary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), and acknowledges the many contributions of the NAACP in helping to create a more equitable and just society.

The NAACP is the oldest civil rights organization in the United States, and blazed the trail towards equal justice for all Americans. The organization has consistently used non-violent means to achieve its goals, and, to this day, emphasizes dutiful civic participation as the best way to promote and protect civil rights.

Ninety-seven years ago this month, a handful of intrepid Americans, including W.E.B. DuBois, Ida Wells Barnett, Mary White Ovington, Oswald Garrison Villiard, William English Walling, and Henry Moscowitz chose to push America towards its highest ideals, forming the National Negro Committee, which

would later come to be known as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. In 1954, the NAACP achieved one of its greatest victories when the Supreme Court ordered in the *Brown v. Board of Education* the desegregation of public schools across the nation “with all deliberate speed.” The NAACP Special Counsel who won this battle would go on to become one of America’s greatest legal minds, Justice Thurgood Marshall.

One year later, in 1955, Rosa Parks’ refusal to yield her seat on a segregated bus served as the impetus for the broader Civil Rights Movement. Parks, a lifelong devotee to the Movement, was a member of the NAACP. In its fight for equality for racial minorities, the NAACP lobbied tirelessly for the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. These two laws served to enshrine for all the cherished constitutional rights that too many had been deprived of for too long, by redressing serious shortcomings in the morality of our nation.

The NAACP continues to fight for the rights of Americans confined to the corners of our society. As recently as last year, the NAACP created the Disaster Relief Fund to aid those who suffered tremendously in the wake of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. The NAACP maintains active branches nationwide, including one in the 12th District of New Jersey, located in Trenton. I am proud of the NAACP members who live in my Congressional District for the work they do to continue to advance the struggle for civil rights in our country.

The NAACP has gracefully and tirelessly fought for the political, social, economic, and educational rights of all Americans, and has sought to ensure that our nation recognized the inalienable rights of all citizens, regardless of race, class, or ethnicity. The enormity of the NAACP’s contributions is immeasurable, and I am proud to join with my colleagues in supporting this resolution.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, today we honor the 97th Anniversary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Since the NAACP was founded on February 12, 1909, it has been committed to achieving its goals through non-violence. As the oldest and largest civil rights organization in the United States, NAACP’s mission is to ensure the political, educational, social, and economic equality of rights for all persons and to eliminate racial hatred and racial discrimination. Its half million adult and youth members throughout the United States are the premier advocates for civil rights in their communities.

This resolution allows us to acknowledge the efforts of the NAACP, including its leadership in lobbying for the passage of landmark laws such as the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and the Fair Housing Act of 1968. In the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, the NAACP launched the Disaster Relief Fund, which has raised almost \$2 million to aid the survivors in Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, Florida, and Alabama. Once again, the NAACP is helping individuals, families and communities in their efforts to recover from disasters and build for the future.

We also celebrate the life, legacy and struggles of civil rights pioneers. Recently, the nation suffered a tremendous loss with the passing of Mrs. Coretta Scott King and Mrs. Rosa

Parks, two phenomenal women who were advocates for civil rights and aided in the mission of the NAACP.

Today, the NAACP remains a valiant crusader for freedom and equality. This anniversary is the occasion to celebrate a heroic past and great achievements and to redouble our efforts for the future. We’ve come a long way but we have many miles yet to go. I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring the NAACP on its 97th Anniversary.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 335 which honors the NAACP on its 97th anniversary.

I rise because of the sacrifice of Goodman, Cheney and Schwerner, Thurgood Marshall and Rosa Parks. I rise and stand on the shoulders of Daisy Bates, Emmett Till and the great Medgar Evers. I rise because the NAACP is the oldest and largest civil rights organization in the United States and has been a force to be reckoned with in every stage of this country’s battle for racial equality.

They were there when four little girls died when the 16th Street Baptist Church was bombed in Montgomery, AL. They were there with the Little Rock Nine when they entered the doors of Central High in Little Rock, AR. They were there fighting for equal educational opportunities in the landmark case of *Brown v. Board of Education*.

And more recently, they were present during the battle to end apartheid in South Africa and they continue to fight for increased voter participation and human equality not only in this Nation, but across the world.

These battles have been waged in the face of intense adversity and widespread resistance, yet the NAACP has endured for 97 years. Throughout the civil rights movement, freedom fighters proclaimed with pride that they were “card carrying members of the NAACP.” They knew then, as we know now, that the NAACP not only stands for equality, it stands for justice, fairness and a better way of life.

We must not forget that the NAACP is the name but the organization is comprised of people. Everyday people that have dedicated their lives to making this world a better place.

So, in honoring the NAACP today, I also honor the people, of all races, that have united as advocates for civil rights and human equality.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on its 97th anniversary. Following the violent race riots in Springfield, IL, in 1909, Ida Wells-Barnett, W.E.B. DuBois, Henry Moscowitz, Mary White Ovington, Oswald Garrison Villiard, and William English Walling came together in New York to form one of the oldest, largest and most influential civil rights organizations in America.

These founders came together with the purpose of promoting and fully recognizing the rights and equality given under the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution. Today, the NAACP works to ensure a society in which all individuals have equal rights and there is no racial hatred or racial discrimination.

The NAACP has influenced some of the greatest civil rights victories of the last century, including: integration of schools and the *Brown v. Board* decision, the Voting Rights Act, striking down segregation and Jim Crow,

the Equal Employment Opportunity Act, and hundreds of community and grassroots initiatives.

Despite the advancements of the past 97 years under the leadership of the NAACP, there is still much work to be done. In the Black community we continue to see disproportionate numbers of African-Americans that experience poverty, unemployment, and economic and social inequality. The NAACP continues to promote new ideas and leadership in the fields of educational and employment opportunities, ending health care disparities, and economic empowerment.

The NAACP instilled in America a sense of consciousness, and continues to do that today through the thousands of individuals who have given not only their time, but their blood, sweat and tears, towards equality and justice.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support House Concurrent Resolution 335, which honors the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) for their many achievements on their anniversary.

For 97 years, the NAACP has led the fight for racial equality in America. Although considerable progress has been made, there is still so much more to be done.

The NAACP has battled for decades in order to change many negative aspects of American society. They have helped people of all races, nationalities and faiths unite on one premise, that all men and women are created equal.

From W.E.B. DuBois to Thurgood Marshall to Bruce Gordon, the NAACP has played an instrumental role in helping eliminate racial prejudice and removing barriers of racial discrimination through the democratic process.

H. Con. Res. 335 underscores the importance of the NAACP and how big of a role they have played in evening the playing field for all citizens, regardless of their race. I support of this important resolution.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, this is a good resolution, I urge all Members to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 335.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2271. An act to clarify that individuals who receive FISA orders can challenge non-disclosure requirements, that individuals who receive national security letters are not required to disclose the name of their attorney, that libraries are not wire or electronic communication service providers unless they provide specific services, and for other purposes.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1501

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

#### HONORING JUSTICE SANDRA DAY O'CONNOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 357.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 357, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—410

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Allen  
Andrews  
Baca  
Bachus  
Baird  
Baker  
Baldwin  
Barrett (SC)  
Barrow  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Bass  
Bean  
Beauprez  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggart  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonner  
Bono  
Boozman  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boustany  
Boyd  
Bradley (NH)  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (OH)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown, Corrine

Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Burgess  
Butterfield  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp (MI)  
Campbell (CA)  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardin  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carson  
Carter  
Case  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chandler  
Chocola  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costello  
Cramer  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
Davis (TN)  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)

DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Emanuel  
Emerson  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Everett  
Farr  
Fattah  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Fitzpatrick (PA)  
Flake  
Foley  
Forbes  
Fossella  
Foxy  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gingrey  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon

Granger  
Graves  
Green (WI)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall  
Harman  
Harris  
Hart  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herseth  
Higgins  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Hostettler  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Inglis (SC)  
Inslee  
Israel  
Issa  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
Jindal  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MN)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick (MI)  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kline  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kuhl (NY)  
LaHood  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Gallegly  
Marchant  
Markey

Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCaul (TX)  
McCollum (MN)  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McMorris  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy  
Murtha  
Muskgrave  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Neugebauer  
Ney  
Northrup  
Norwood  
Nunes  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Osborne  
Otter  
Owens  
Oxley  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Paul  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothman  
Royce

Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Sabo  
Salazar  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Saxton  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schwartz (PA)  
Schwarz (MI)  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherman  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Sodrel  
Solis  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Strickland  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Tancredo  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Towns  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Westmoreland  
Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

#### NOT VOTING—22

Burton (IN)  
Costa  
DeLay  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
English (PA)  
Evans

Ford  
Fortenberry  
Hinchey  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Kucinich

LaTourette  
Lucas  
Millender-McDonald  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George

Myrick  
ReichertRoybal-Allard  
SandersSmith (NJ)  
Sweeney

□ 1525

So (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, due to illness I was regrettably unable to be on the House Floor for rollcall vote 17, final passage of H. Res. 357, a bill to honor Justice Sandra Day O'Connor on the occasion of her retirement from the United States Supreme Court and to commend her for her hard work and dedication to the law.

Had I been here I would have unquestionably voted "yea" on rollcall vote 17.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained at the United States Supreme Court, which is hearing the Texas redistricting case. Had I been present, I would have voted an enthusiastic "yea" on the Sandra Day O'Connor resolution.

#### U.N. HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge other nations to join us in the United States in voting against the proposed United Nations Human Rights Council. This council is by no means true reform. Some may argue that we have actually gone from bad to worse; that it is easier for the likes of China or Syria, Iran, Burma and Cuba to get on this council than it would be for the United States.

That is what we are dealing with in the current proposal. All countries on the U.N. General Assembly are eligible to become members no matter what their human rights record. This is the same General Assembly that in November of last year, amidst the horrible genocide taking place in Darfur, could not agree that Sudan was guilty of human rights violations.

For the sake of the victims of human rights abuses, we must take immediate action to prevent this travesty. Let us support our ambassador, John Bolton, in rejecting this so-called reform package which is nothing but a sham.

#### PORT SECURITY

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think there are many issues we can be addressing; but as I recently came back from my district, it is amazing how the idea of selling our ports has caught the hearts and minds of the American people. So I think it is

important that we owe them both an explanation and also we owe them the responsibility of oversight.

It is important to note that in the 2007 budget we have cut resources for port security, and as well it is important to note that our largest ports in America are suffering under either no appropriations from the Federal Government of America or minimal support.

And so I offer legislation, one, to have a 2-year moratorium on the sale, leasing or operating of any of America's ports by foreign entities. And then I would ask for a major study by the Office of the Comptroller and Homeland Security to be able to determine the status of security in the Nation's ports.

It would be shocking to note that in Hong Kong, every cargo is surveyed, every cargo container. In the United States we do not do that. I believe we owe the American people secure ports, and we are prepared to do so.

□ 1530

#### HONORING PFC DANIEL WILSON

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to honor a true American hero and to recognize the thousands of brave men and women that are currently serving our country both at home and abroad.

In December of last year, PFC Daniel Wilson of Cherokee County, Georgia, was on patrol in Baghdad; and like so many of his fellow soldiers, Wilson understood that these patrols are part of his everyday life and that it is a risk that they assume selflessly. On this particular day, Wilson's HUMVEE struck a land mine, throwing both Wilson and fellow soldier out of their vehicle. The wounds that PFC Wilson suffered were thankfully not fatal.

In February of this year, the Army awarded PFC Wilson a Purple Heart, and I rise today to say thank you to this young man. We send our deepest gratitude and respect to all of those serving in our Armed Forces. We here at home often do not take the time to truly appreciate how blessed we are.

The members of the United States military stand on the front lines of a great struggle to preserve freedom and democracy, and we could not ask for a more capable and professional group of men and women protecting our way of life.

#### HALLIBURTON REIMBURSEMENT

(Ms. MCKINNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Pentagon announced that it is returning \$288 out of \$300 million it was holding while investigating Halliburton for overcharging, even though

Halliburton was previously caught overcharging the Pentagon by \$27 million for meals for our troops.

Mr. Speaker, even as tens of thousands of Hurricane Katrina survivors face eviction due to FEMA, the United States Government is handing hundreds of millions of dollars to a company which has been plagued by allegations and admissions of fraud, waste, abuse, bribery and kickbacks.

The Coalition Provisional Authority in Iraq was itself unable to account for \$9 billion, with over a billion of this reportedly having been lost to Halliburton.

Today, I urge Congress to establish a permanent war profiteering committee modeled after the Truman Commission after the Second World War.

Before this Congress writes the President another blank check, we need to investigate the gross incompetence and even corruption that exists with this administration.

#### DEAL, ORDEAL AND NO DEAL

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, the fiasco of allowing a foreign-owned corporation, foreign-country-owned company to come into our port situation, have information about our manifests, about ports, the shipping information, has gone through three parts.

First of all, it was the part of the deal. It was a deal that nobody knew about here in this House of Representatives. Once we found out about the deal, it has now gone through the ordeal, where we are bringing transparency to this deal that was bad for America. And soon hopefully, Mr. Speaker, it will be no deal because it is not a deal that is good for the United States, and it is certainly not good for Homeland Security.

Allowing a foreign country to own a corporation that goes into our ports and has access to information is a bad deal, no deal for the United States.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky). The Chair will recognize Members for special order speeches without prejudice to the possible resumption of legislative business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. OSBORNE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 2-month anniversary of the Medicare prescription drug benefit, and it would not be too much of an exaggeration to say that, so far, the Part D, D stands for disaster.

The benefit is so complicated and convoluted that even beneficiaries with Ph.D.s have said they could not figure it out.

Why is this program so flawed? Because it was designed, or we like to say in the private sector, the first operation is take care of the customer first. I have yet to find a single pharmaceutical executive or an HMO executive who is complaining about this program, but I have found a heck of a lot of senior citizens who are complaining about this program. This program was never designed with our senior citizens in mind. If it was, you would not have the complexities that are happening for our senior citizens.

The executives of the drug companies will earn \$139 billion of additional profits that they would not have earned any other way; insurance companies, \$130 billion of additional profits over the next 10 years.

The complexity of the benefit shows, in my view, what was wrong and what we should have done right. Three simple steps:

One, with the May 15 penalty that will kick in, the tax, the senior Medicare tax, postpone that until HHS and CMS figure out what they should be doing, rather than what they should not be doing. No senior should be forced into a program where even the people running it do not know what they are doing.

Second, directly negotiate for prices. That is what the Veterans' Administration does. That is what Sam's Club does. That is what Target does. That is what Costco does. Anybody in the private sector, literally, bulk purchases get a better price than anybody buying individually.

And third, allow people competitive choices by reimportation, allowing them to buy drugs in Canada, England, France, where they can get competitive pricing which is 50 percent cheaper.

I have a Costco in Chicago. There is also a Costco in Toronto. We have up on our Web site the two Costcos, one in Toronto, one in Chicago. Same 10 drugs, same milligram, same dosage; and the Costco in Toronto is constantly \$1,000 cheaper for the same drugs over the same period of time than the one in Chicago. And yet both of them are stores that are supposed to be discount.

And lastly, allow generics to market quicker. If you had direct negotiations, reimportation, generics to market quicker, three free market principles where competition and choice rule, we would actually have cheaper pharmaceutical prices, things that seniors can afford, and save money for taxpayers as well.

And yet what we do not have are those programs. And we are forcing in the middle of May, May 15, senior citizens will literally pay a Medicare privatization tax.

On April 15, all Americans will pay a tax. On May 15, because of the complexity of this program, seniors will begin to pay a tax for the complexities.

Seniors that do not want to join this program, that are confused because of the way that they have been forced into plans, had plans drop their drugs, not offer all the drugs they need at a better price than they can get otherwise, will literally start to be taxed by the Federal Government.

Tens of thousands of beneficiaries, today in the New York Times an article highlighted that the beneficiaries are automatically assigned to plans and deciding to switch plans are finding that they are actively enrolled in two drug plans at the same time.

When you read a report on what is going on, you would think you were reading an after-action report on Katrina. What has happened over at HHS and Health and Human Services on Medicare is literally one more example of the disaster the Federal Government has had in running this plan. The situation leaves patients at risk, being charged two premiums or incorrect copayments.

In my hometown of Chicago, seniors have 62 separate drug plans to pick from. And I hear constantly from my constituents every day that the choices are causing confusion and problems. Pharmacists are not sure what is happening. The people administering the plans are not sure what is happening, and it is leaving seniors absolutely in total confusion.

Seniors need clearly more time to figure this out. They should not be penalized with a complexity tax, a privatization tax for taking the time to get the facts. Facts, I remind you, that even HHS and Medicare are not sure of what the facts are as it relates to what is the best plan.

Just to give you an idea of the tax we are talking about, if a senior decided to wait for 2 years before enrolling, there will be a 24 percent higher premium to pay. That is an additional \$7.73 per month on top of the monthly premium. If a senior waits longer, it can go as high as \$456 a year. For seniors on a fixed income, this is a tremendous financial burden.

Even before the drug benefit went into effect on January 1, there were problems. And the Republican colleagues who wrote the plan know what the problems are.

In fact, the drug manufacturers, again, I would like to repeat and I will

be done: \$139 billion in profits over the next 8 years and insurers, \$130 million.

#### THE THIEVES OF KATRINA AND RITA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, in the disturbing days following Hurricane Katrina there was much confusion and chaos and catastrophe. Isaac Carloss and his wife, Debbie Anderson, used this tragedy to take advantage of innocent victims of this hurricane. Their deceptive and lawless journey was only recently halted by the Department of Justice.

According to the DOJ, Carloss' wife, Debbie, met an evacuee at a rescue shelter following the hurricane. Since the evacuee was unable to return to his home, Debbie gave the individual permission to use her address and receive mail. The evacuee then applied for FEMA assistance, and an express mail package addressed to the evacuee was sent to Debbie's residence. Debbie signed for the package with a fictitious name, opened the mail, and started her illegal spending spree across Louisiana.

The package included two FEMA disaster assistance checks totaling over \$4,000 intended for the evacuee. But Diane, Isaac and Debbie took these checks and went directly to the local car dealership where they used one of the checks to purchase a car. She then took the other check to a bank in Louisiana where she persuaded the teller to cash the check because they were victims, or she was a victim of the hurricane.

Just last week, in Louisiana, her husband, Isaac, was found guilty of one count of conspiracy, one count of theft of mail and two counts of theft of public money. He faces a sentence up to 5 years in prison. His wife, Debbie, has already pleaded guilty in January to a count of conspiracy. This is just one of the many examples of the vagrants that cheated the government and the victims of Hurricane Katrina and Rita.

Six months ago, when the ladies of the gulf, Katrina and Rita, pounded the gulf coast, thousands of people were left dismayed. They were distressed and in desperate need of aid. In the days following the hurricanes FEMA quickly began disbursing money to suffering victims. However, amidst all the confusion and chaos, fraud started. Now, 6 months later and millions of dollars wasted later, the winds have subsided, but the deception continues and the shady scams are getting more disturbing every day.

According to a recent Government Accounting study, Federal investigators have learned 1,000 people who applied for aid used Social Security numbers of dead people; 1,000 used bogus, nonexistent numbers, and tens of thousands have used names, birth dates and Social Security numbers of people that did not match.

The report also found that up to 900,000 of the 2.5 million applicants to receive aid under FEMA's emergency assistance program were based upon duplicate or invalid Social Security numbers or false addresses. Additionally, duplicate payments were made to some people who applied first with debit cards then again by electronic bank transfer.

The GAO reported another example where one person used 15 different Social Security numbers and received payments totaling \$41,000, money he has stolen from the victims and from the taxpayers.

The corruption is chilling. With FEMA debit cards an individual in Jefferson, Louisiana, spent \$1,300 on a pistol. An individual in Houston, Texas spent \$1,200 at a gentleman's club with his FEMA debit card. And the list goes on: diamond engagement rings, gambling, bail bondsmen, tattoos, massages, alcohol and adult erotic products.

We also have learned that hotel rooms in New York City have cost the taxpayers \$500 a night, beachfront apartments being rented in the same amounts were all paid for by FEMA, which really means paid for by other taxpayers. Reports have even surfaced about emergency meals being sold on eBay.

Legitimate, law-abiding citizens are suffering because of these disgraceful and despicable delinquents that have chosen to take advantage of this tragedy.

These criminals should be found and they should go to jail, and anyone in the Federal Government that has helped them should be in jail as well. These crimes took place at the detriment of real victims, and they have cheated the system and deserve to be punished. There must be a zero tolerance policy for these scam artists and it must be stopped.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we hear of the other abuses in the system where FEMA has spent millions of dollars for 10,000 brand-new, fully furnished trailers, but they are not being used for any victims of this disaster. They are being stored in Hope, Arkansas, because FEMA regulations prevent those trailers from being in flood plains. Of course, it is the flood plains that were affected by these hurricanes. And according to a Fox News report, the cost of these trailers is \$367 million.

And now we learn that these 10,000 trailers sitting in Arkansas, because of the weather, are starting to sink in the mud. This is ridiculous, how FEMA has abused the system by not being prepared for this disaster.

Mr. Speaker, it has been over 6 months since Hurricane Katrina, 4 months since Hurricane Rita. There are still people that are suffering. We have got to take control of this situation. We have to remove the incompetence, and people who have committed crimes must be punished and sent to jail. There need to be no ex-

cuses because of inefficient red tape or lawlessness. These people need to be held accountable, both those in the Federal Government and others.

Mr. Speaker, that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1545

#### CALLING FOR INVESTIGATION INTO THE DUBAI DEAL TO MANAGE U.S. PORTS

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the Special Order time of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, my Special Order this evening concerns the proposed acquisition of Dubai Ports World of the leasing contracts for several major U.S. ports on the east coast. And in relation to that, I have sent letters to the Treasury Inspector General and to the committee of jurisdiction here in the House, the Government Reform Committee, asking both those entities to review any conflict of interest regarding the participation of the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury, John Snow, who chairs the Committee on Foreign Investment, the group which approved the recent contract with Dubai Ports World. I will place these two letters of request in the RECORD.

The letters ask the committee and the Inspector General to determine whether appropriate processes were followed, conflicts of interests explored, and whether or not American companies were solicited during that process. The Treasury agreement itself raises serious ethical questions regarding those directly responsible for this decision. In particular, given that Dubai Ports World acquired CSX World Terminals in 2004 for \$1.15 billion, a company of which Secretary of the Treasury John Snow was chair prior to coming to the administration, and this should raise serious questions both about the acquisition of the CSX port operations and the recent awarding of this contract.

As chair of the U.S. Treasury Committee on Foreign Investment, Secretary Snow and the Treasury Department had the lead authority in approving the Dubai transaction. Secretary Snow holds a deferred compensation package and a special retirement pension from his days as CEO of CSX Corporation. In 2004 CSX World Terminals

was acquired by Dubai Ports World, the successful bidder on this contract. But given that Secretary Snow had previously disclosed a deferred compensation package with CSX valued at between \$5 million and \$25 million and \$33.2 million from a special retirement pension, one would expect that any financial benefit from the sale of CSX World Terminals to Dubai Ports World, including any stock holdings, would have been revealed, especially if there might be any residual from subsequent actions such as these.

The President's assertion that he had polled his Cabinet Secretaries on the Dubai deal causes concern for me that at least one, Secretary Snow, should have removed himself from the decision, given his business connections to CSX and Dubai.

On 9/11, two members of the hijack team that simultaneously downed the Twin Towers in New York City and killed hundreds of Americans at the Pentagon were from the United Arab Emirates. And as the 9/11 Commission reported, those same terrorists laundered much of the money for their operation through the United Arab Emirates-controlled banks.

We should ask instead of developing our own companies to manage our own U.S. operations, why should we settle for the revolving door that has skilled people move from one company to another, creating a pea-in-the-shell game that leaves the public wondering who is in charge and does anyone care? And, importantly, is America for sale at any price?

Secretary of the Treasury John Snow was CEO of CSX just about a year before CSX sold some of its international operations to Dubai Ports World. Was this billion-dollar deal done totally after he left, or was it already in the works while he served as CEO of that company? Why is it that no one at Treasury said that Secretary Snow recused himself from this transaction until they were called about it? Secretary Snow himself claimed not to have known about the deal. How can someone not know about a deal from which they should recuse themselves?

The White House has appointed David Sanborn as the new administrator of the Maritime Administration. He worked as Dubai Ports World director of operations in Europe and Latin America until he was appointed to the post in January, the same month the Treasury Department's Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States approved the Dubai Ports World takeover. David Sanborn also previously worked for the CSX Corporation. The revolving door brings him back to a high government position. Some Senators have vowed to block Sanborn's nomination unless he testifies before the Commerce Committee.

CNN has reported that the United Arab Emirates is a major investor in the Carlyle Group, the private equity investment firm where President Bush's father once served as senior adviser and is a who's who of former

high-level government officials. Just last year, Dubai International Capital, a government-backed buyout firm, invested \$8 billion in the Carlyle fund.

Another Bush family connection, the President's brother Neil Bush, has reportedly received funding for his educational software company from the United Arab Emirates investors.

And why did George Bush, Sr. accept a \$1 million donation to his library in Texas from the United Arab Emirates?

The material previously referred to is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, February 23, 2006.

Hon. TOM DAVIS,  
Chairman, Committee on Government Reform,  
Rayburn HOB, Washington, DC.

Hon. HENRY WAXMAN,  
Ranking Member, Committee on Government Reform,  
Rayburn HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DAVIS AND RANKING MEMBER WAXMAN: The recent announcement of a contract being awarded by the U.S. Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States to Dubai Ports World following its purchase of London-based Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Co. is a matter of paramount concern that should be investigated in the national interest.

It raises concerns of national security as the operator will be a foreign interest, most particularly an undemocratic nation from the Middle East that cannot assure infiltrators will not breach security. We know less than 2% of container cargo is inspected today despite Congressional efforts to upgrade the current system. Iran's growing ties with China which ships the majority of its cargo through the Dubai/CSX hub terminal in Singapore complicates the situation.

In addition, the Treasury agreement raises serious ethical questions regarding those directly responsible for this decision. In particular, given that Dubai Ports World acquired CSX World Terminals in 2004 for \$1.15 billion, a company of which Secretary of the Treasury John Snow was Chairman prior to coming to the Administration should raise questions about both the acquisition of the CSX port operations and the recent awarding of the contract. Secretary Snow now chairs the Committee on Foreign Investments in the United States, the very group which approved this contract with Dubai Ports World.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Government Reform Committee to conduct an investigation and a series of hearings to learn more about these matters to determine whether appropriate processes were followed, conflicts of interest explored, and whether or not American companies were solicited in this process.

This deal is not in our national interest most especially during a time of war. Foreign management of key U.S. assets endangers the public and our communities in an era where terrorists seek to infiltrate. I hope you will agree with me that a thorough investigation is warranted.

Sincerely,

MARCY KAPTUR,  
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, February 23, 2006.

Mr. HAROLD DAMELIN,  
Inspector General, Department of the Treasury,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. DAMELIN: The recent announcement of a contract being awarded by the U.S. Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States to Dubai Ports World fol-

lowing its purchase of London-based Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Co. is a matter of paramount concern that should be investigated in the national interest.

I respectfully request that your office conduct an investigation in to the deliberations by the U.S. Committee on Foreign Investment with particular respect to the legislative requirements established by the Byrd Amendment that requires an investigation in cases where: (1) the acquirer is controlled by or acting on behalf of a foreign government (as is the case in this instance); and, (2) the acquisition "could result in control of a person engaged in interstate commerce in the U.S. that could affect the national security of the U.S." While the Committee's role may have been only to review this particular foreign applicant, I believe it is also important to know what specific action was taken to solicit an American contractor for the management of these several strategic ports, or if there had been consideration given to several different American contractors for each or several of these ports, and who was responsible for this solicitation. Certainly one could reasonably assume that this is an issue that should have been reviewed by the Committee in its evaluation of national security concerns.

Furthermore, it has been noted that the Secretary of the Treasury serves as Chairman of the U.S. Committee on Foreign Investment. In this case, Secretary John Snow had previously served as the Chairman of CSX Corporation, which at the time of his service owned CSX World Terminals. Subsequently CSX World Terminals was acquired by Dubai Ports World, the successful bidder on this contract. Given that Sec. Snow had previously disclosed a deferred compensation package with CSX valued at between \$5 and \$25 million and \$33.2 million from a special retirement pension, one would expect that any financial benefit from the sale of CSX World Terminals to Dubai Ports World, including any stock holdings, would have been revealed, especially if there might be any residual from subsequent actions such as these. I ask that you review this matter to determine if there may have been any conflict of interest in Secretary Snow having presided over the decision, and whether or not he should have recused himself from the proceeding.

I look forward to your response to this request.

Sincerely,

MARCY KAPTUR,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### DEBT ADDICTION

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows our country is deeply in debt.

Most Americans decry the rampant growth in government spending. Essentially, however, no one in Washington is concerned enough to do anything about it.

Debt is like an addiction: the political pain of withdrawal keeps politicians spending, so they do not offend any special interest groups demanding that government benefits continue. As with all addictions, long-term dependency on a dangerous substance can kill the patient. Dependency on bad policy also can destroy the goose that many believe lays the golden egg.

Our ever-increasing government expenditures, which perpetuate a runaway welfare/warfare state, simply are not sustainable. The fallacy comes from the belief that government can provide for our needs and manage a worldwide empire. In truth, government can provide benefits only by first taking resources from productive American citizens or borrowing against the future. Inevitably, government programs exceed the productive capacity of the people or their willingness to finance wasteful spending.

The authority to accumulate deficits provides a tremendous incentive to politicians to increase spending. Total spending is the real culprit. The more government taxes, borrows, or inflates, the less chance the people have to spend their resources wisely. The way government spends money also causes great harm. By their very nature, governments are inefficient and typically operate as we recently witnessed with FEMA in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas over the last 6 months. Governments are bureaucratic, inefficient, and invite fraud. This is just as true in foreign affairs as it is in domestic affairs. Throughout history, foreign military adventurism has been economically harmful for those nations bent on intervening abroad. Our Nation is no different.

Largesse at home and militarism abroad requires excessive spending and taxation, pushing deficits to a point where the whole system collapses. The biggest recent collapse was the fall of the Soviet Empire just 15 years ago. My contention is that we are not immune from a similar crisis. Today, our national debt is \$8.257 trillion. Interestingly, the legal debt limit is \$8.184 trillion.

This means we currently are \$73 billion over the legal debt limit. Creative financing Washington-style allows this to happen, but soon Congress will be forced to increase the national debt limit by hundreds of billions of dollars. Congress will raise the limit, quietly if necessary; and the deficit spiral will continue for a while longer.

But this official debt figure barely touches the subject. Total obligations of the Federal Government, including Social Security and Medicare and prescription drugs, are now over \$50 trillion, a sum younger generations will not be able to pay. This means the standard of living of a lot of Americans

who are retired will decline sharply in the near future.

Two vehicles are used to fund this wild spending. First, the Federal Reserve creates dollars out of thin air and purchases Treasury bills without limit, a very nice convenience.

Second, foreign entities, mostly central banks, own \$1.5 trillion of our debt. They purchased over \$200 billion in just the last 12 months, increasing their holdings by 15 percent. This is a consequence of our current account deficit and the outsourcing of more and more American manufacturing jobs. Few economists argue that this arrangement can continue much longer.

Excessive spending, a rapidly growing national debt, the Federal Reserve inflation machine, and foreign borrowing all put pressure on the dollar. Unless we treat our addiction to debt, it will play havoc with the dollar, undermine our economic well-being, and destroy our liberties. It is time for us to get our house in order.

#### EVALUATING HEALTH AND SAFETY REGULATIONS IN THE AMERICAN MINING INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, earlier today the Education and the Workforce Committee had a subcommittee hearing dealing with the mine safety issues around the recent tragedies that happened in the Sago mine disaster in January of this year. Unfortunately, that hearing was arbitrarily gavelled to adjournment at a time before members could have exercised their rights to ask questions of the witnesses that were there from the Mine Safety Administration, the United Mine Workers, and the mine association of the companies.

Had we had the opportunity without the arbitrary adjournment of the hearing, we would have tried to ask the Mine Safety Administration how they have come to delay and weaken and scrap the 18 regulations that were put forth to protect the miners in the coal mining industry of this Nation and, in fact, regulations that may very well have been able to save the miners, the 12 miners who died in the Sago mine disaster. But we were not allowed to ask that question because of the adjournment by the chairman of the committee.

We would have asked them whether or not they have ignored the requirements of the law that no standard put in place be less protective than the existing standard, as they have continued to chisel away at the safety standards for the miners working in deep coal mines of this Nation, meeting our energy demands for this Nation, for the miners and their families, who every day make the decision to go into the mines in this hazardous occupation.

We would have also asked them whether or not, when they see the fail-

ure of the regulations to protect these miners, whether or not this shift of enforcement and the loss of enforcement personnel to a compliance assistance philosophy to work voluntarily with the mining companies, whether or not that led to this mine accident, especially when this particular mine, the Sago mine, had 208 violations in 2005.

It is clear that the owners were interested in maximizing their profits and not complying with safety laws, and it is clear that the penalty system that we have in place does not deter repeat violations, because the Sago mine had many repeat violations, serious violations of the safety rules dealing with combustible gases in the mine and the protection of these miners.

We would have also tried to ask them whether or not they felt that Congress had exercised its oversight authority, since this was the first oversight hearing on mine safety in 5 years.

We would have also asked them to stop shutting out the public in the decision-making process. We would have asked the administration to open up all of its records, including the inspector's notes, to public scrutiny around the Sago mine disaster so that we can be able to do the work to determine whether or not we could have prevented this disaster that took these lives.

We also would have made sure that they would have put in place common-sense rules dealing with the ability to communicate with the miners who were in the mine. We now think we are learning that it might have been possible for those miners to walk out of the mine had they known where they were and had we been able to communicate with them. And while communications devices are available, they are used in some American mines, they are used in some Canadian mines, they are used in Australian mines, they are not very well used, if at all, in the U.S. coal mining industry; and yet the government has done nothing to try to push this technology so we could have had communications with these miners.

□ 1600

Also the idea of locators, so that we would have been able to send a message to these miners about what their situation was and what they might have done to prolong their lives, because we now know they were down in that mine for a very long time waiting to be rescued, but that did not happen.

As we heard from Amber Helms, the 23-year-old daughter of Terry Helms, who died in the explosion, he died in the explosion, she asked us why if she can set up a Web page in her computer, if we can communicate to the solar system, if we can communicate around the world, why couldn't we have communicated to her father and those other men down in that mine that lost their lives?

Why wasn't this put in place when the cost of the items to protect their

lives ranged from apparently \$20 to \$200? It means nothing in terms of the profits of these mines, the revenues they generate and the overriding concern for the safety of their miners.

But, no, we didn't have a chance to ask these questions, because after one round of questioning, the chairman decided that enough was enough, that we were not going to have the opportunity to ask the Mine Safety Administration, Where have you been for 5 years on the issue of rescue chambers in mines and the protection of these miners, and when are their families going to get these answers?

Well, they didn't get them today, and apparently they are not going to get them from the Congress for a very long time.

This Congress has been blind to the need to maintain even the protections that already exist under the law. It was not long ago that some members of our committee, including its former chairman, were actively seeking legislation to abolish MSHA and NIOSH and to cut back critical enforcement provisions.

Under that legislation, 3 out of the 4 mandatory annual inspections at every underground mine would have been eliminated. Inspectors would have needed a warrant before entering mine property. Only miners in unionized mines would have had the right to accompany inspectors as they examined the mine. The circumstances in which an inspector could shut down an unsafe section of a mine would have been restricted. Mine operators would not have had to pay fines for typical citations as long as the hazards were abated. And on and on.

That legislation was defeated. But that apparently hasn't deterred Administration officials from trying to gut MSHA anyway. Now they're just dismantling it and taking it out the back door, where they think no one is watching. Well, we are watching, and legislation must be enacted to ensure that changes are made, changes that make the safety and health of these mine workers a priority, and that prevent the industry from being allowed to get away with further abuses.

I want to commend my colleagues, Congressman RAHALL of West Virginia, and the West Virginia delegation, for their prompt hearings and action on these issues. On February 1st, they introduced H.R. 4695, the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 2006, which enhances and reinforces the original purpose of the landmark Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, as amended by the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977. This legislation is a vital step in this process, and an effort that I am hoping will be a catalyst for change.

Amber's testimony, and the powerful and courageous testimony provided by all

The witnesses at the forum is documented on DVD. I strongly urge all members of this subcommittee to watch the footage of the forum, and the incredibly important questions

posed by these witnesses, questions that have unfortunately, been asked before, but that have not been answered, not by the administration, and not by MSHA. As Amber said:

I understand that nothing that I say today or nothing that happens in the future is going to bring my Dad back. But my Uncle Johnny, my Uncle Mike, my cousin Rocky, as well as every other miner that is underground and every other son who's getting ready to go into the coal mines—because that's where the jobs are in West Virginia and maybe some of these other states—we can prevent their families from going through this.

We owe it to Amber and every other American who has lost a loved one in a mining accident to learn what more we can do to make mines safer. And then, just as Amber says, we must take action to prevent more families from going through the hell that she has had to go through.

#### CELEBRATING THE INDEPENDENCE OF TEXAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, 1839, the Republic of Texas declared its independence on the banks of the Brazos River, which eventually gave rise to the great Lone Star State. Tomorrow, in honor of this historic event in Texas and American history, we will celebrate Texas Independence Day.

I am proud to say that part of this great story of freedom, independence and democracy took place in the 10th Congressional District of Texas, the district I am proud to say I represent.

Texas Independence Day marks a time when today's Texans honor and celebrate the work and sacrifice of Texans many generations ago, people who heroically claimed their freedom from Mexico and sought out their own destiny governed by the laws of a true democracy, a constitution written by the people and the colors of their country's flag waving over what would become the free and independent Republic of Texas.

Between 1820 and 1836, the Mexican Government offered Americans the opportunity to live and work in Texas under Mexican rule, but they grew disheartened by the tyranny and depression. In the Steven F. Austin Colony, which was the first colony, Texans first established a provisional government in 1835 with the intention of writing a declaration of independence soon after. However, the Mexican army was intent on destroying any move toward Texas independence, and the Consultation of 1835, as it was known, adjourned without the organization needed to continue the cause for freedom.

Less than a year later, many of the same delegates present at the Consultation of 1835 arrived along the banks of the Brazos River in the town of Washington, just north of the Austin Colony, which is now Austin County.

By the spring of 1836, the encroachments on Texans' basic freedoms had reached a flash point. On March 1, 1836, 59 delegates hailing from all corners of Texas arrived at the village of Washington along the Brazos River to decide the principles they would invoke in claiming their freedom from Mexico.

There, these brave men drafted the language that would declare their independence from Mexico, and they did so knowing full well that they may have to pay the ultimate price for freedom. As the delegates along the Brazos River wrote the Texas declaration of independence, patriots like Davy Crockett, Jim Bowie and William Travis fought and died for Texas freedom at the Alamo.

After successfully gaining independence from Mexico, Republic of Texas President Sam Houston in 1842 moved the Republic's capital to the birthplace of Texas, Washington on the Brazos River. Three years later, by an act of the United States Congress, Texas was made part of the American Union and became the 28th State of the United States of America.

There can be no argument about the Lone Star State's significant contributions to American history, and we must remember the actions and the sacrifices of those who made Texas independence a reality.

Washington on the Brazos represents an historic event that took place long ago, but tonight we remember Washington on the Brazos as the place where the proud Republic of Texas was born with the desire for freedom and an undying spirit of democracy.

Today, we see that same spirit and determination for freedom and democracy in our fighting men and women overseas and in the people and countries they have liberated. As with the first Texans, those people in distant lands know what it means to be liberated from tyranny and drink from the cup of freedom. They, too, will succeed and flourish in a free and democratic society.

#### PROVIDING MENTAL HEALTH FOR VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken many times from this podium, over 130 times actually, about the moral imperative of bringing our troops home from Iraq. With sectarian strife reaching a bloody, violent high in Iraq last week, it is clear that our military presence is doing more harm than good. But for many of our Iraq veterans, even an immediate end to the occupation would be too late to spare them a possible lifetime of physical and psychological damage.

Much is made, and with good reason, of the physical wounds suffered in combat, but even those who return home physically unharmed often face terri-

fying demons. Even the toughest, bravest and best trained soldiers are not immune to devastating trauma, the result of daily exposure to danger and unspeakable carnage. These demons must be addressed, and they must be addressed medically in order for many soldiers to return to normal, productive lives.

But the Washington Post reports today that not enough veterans are getting the mental health care they need. One-third of returning Iraq and Afghanistan veterans are seeking mental health services, and the great majority of those who are diagnosed with psychiatric problems are going untreated.

It is a budget problem and it is a diagnostic problem. Given the nature of the war in Iraq, we must adjust the official standards for what constitutes trauma and, thus, what qualifies veterans for subsidized treatment.

Because the combat danger in Iraq is anywhere and everywhere, many, many of our troops are exposed to conditions that lead to mental distress. As one psychiatrist at Walter Reed explained, "There is no front line in Iraq, and everyone in a convoy is a target." Steve Robinson, head of the National Gulf War Research Center, told the Post that there are few sanctuaries in Iraq. "Every place," he said, "is a war zone."

Meanwhile, it seems the Department of Veterans Affairs is poorly equipped to deal with this situation. Today's Washington Post article cites budget constraints and worries that the Department won't be able to handle the huge influx of returning soldiers in need of mental health treatment.

But who caused those budget constraints? Certainly it wasn't our troops in Iraq who foolishly promised that we could fight a quarter-of-a-trillion-dollar war and dole out billions of dollars of tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans. It wasn't our troops who twisted arms to pass this Medicare Part D boondoggle, which is subsidizing the drug companies and the insurance interests while leaving seniors to wrestle with a bewildering bureaucracy.

Is there any reason why we couldn't have anticipated an enormous demand for Iraq-related mental health services? Of course there wasn't. Couldn't we have included enough money into the war supplemental bills this body has passed? Couldn't we have sacrificed other budgetary handouts and goodies, the ones that benefit people who haven't offered a fraction of the sacrifice for their country that our Iraq veterans have?

I guess if you assumed that our troops would be greeted in Iraq as liberators and if you assumed that we would be in and out of Iraq in a flash, you never got the got to the point where you worried about the mental health of returning veterans.

Once again we see the disastrous, tragic consequences of failed planning and poor execution of this war.

We must do everything we can to help our Iraq veterans cope with their traumas. It is the least our government can do after sending them to war on false pretenses, with insufficient equipment and without an exit strategy.

But as an even more urgent matter, we can ensure that no more soldiers suffer from terrifying nightmares and setbacks and flashbacks by ending this occupation and bringing them home at once.

I have actually presented my four-point plan for a radical shift in our Iraq policy to the President of the United States. This policy includes four major areas:

One, greater multilateral cooperation with our allies in enlisting their help in establishing an interim security force in Iraq;

Two, a diplomatic offensive that recasts our role in Iraq as construction partner, rather than military occupier; this means no permanent bases in Iraq, no American claims on Iraqi oil;

Three, a robust post-conflict reconciliation process with a peace commission established to coordinate talks between the Iraqi factions; and

Four, and most importantly, withdrawal of the U.S. Armed Forces.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### ENCOURAGING NEWS ON MEDICARE PART D

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of turn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the encouraging news that more than 25 million seniors are now enjoying prescription drug coverage under Medicare Part D. This includes over 1.5 million Americans who have enrolled in the last month alone.

Twenty-five million enrollees. That is 25 million seniors who are saving money every time they visit the pharmacy, 25 million seniors who have better access to drugs they need to prevent and manage their illnesses, 25 million seniors who can now afford protection from many catastrophic medical costs.

Like many of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I am working incredibly hard to educate seniors about Medicare Part D. With any new program, parts of the enrollment process certainly can be confusing. After all, this is the largest enrollment effort since the introduction of Medicare 40 years ago. But by investing a little time, seniors can nar-

row down their choices and find the plan that best fits their prescription drug needs. And let me assure you, the benefits of this program are undoubtedly worth that effort.

I have been thanked by so many seniors who are now reaping the benefits of prescription drug coverage under Medicare, seniors who have seen their prescription drug costs drop by 50 percent or more, seniors who now have more money in their pockets at the end of the month.

In fact, I would like to share with my colleagues two of the many success stories I have heard from my constituents regarding their positive experiences. I hope these stories will encourage other seniors to explore the savings Medicare Part D holds for them.

Take the experience of Carol Burke. She lives in Newnan, Georgia, in my district, my wife's hometown. She recently wrote me, saying, "I am disturbed by media commentators repeatedly referring to the Medicare drug plan as too difficult to understand and a total disaster. I never hear them say what I truly believe, that it is a wonderful benefit to those of us who have no retirement drug plan provided. A few hours spent with pencil and paper show that the choice to pay a slightly larger premium and have no deductible is clear. The suggestions given in the Medicare 2006 Guidebook are complete and easy to follow, and math is not my strong suit. Thank you for your efforts in providing this much-needed service to seniors."

Now, my colleagues, that is a real letter, and I completely agree with Mrs. Burke's assessment. It may take a little time to choose the right plan. Seniors might need to rely on family, friends and community organizations to help with the process. But a little time spent enrolling today will pay huge dividends in the upcoming months and years, because affordable prescription drugs help seniors live healthier lives.

□ 1615

Let me share another story with you. I received a phone call from fellow Georgian Mr. Richard Mosrie who recently enrolled in the Medicare part D plan.

Mr. Mosrie explained that he is now saving over \$150 a month on his medications, \$150 a month. Seniors across America understand what a difference a couple hundred dollars a month can make. These are the stories that seniors need to hear. These are the stories that are happening in every congressional district in America regardless of whether the Congressman or -woman is a Republican or a Democrat.

I find it disappointing that there are people who attempt to use Medicare part D as a political ploy. How cruel to put partisanship over the health of our seniors by encouraging people not to enroll in this great program. That is, in essence, encouraging seniors not to save money and not to improve their

health. So, Mr. Speaker, in the following months we will be hearing more and more positive stories from seniors who have enrolled in Medicare part D who are reaping financial and health rewards.

The initial sign-up period runs through May 15, 2006, so there is still time for seniors to enroll without a premium penalty.

As a physician, I know that access to the right medication is a bedrock of good health. Our seniors deserve affordable prescription drug coverage and Congress has passed good legislation to deliver this benefit.

Now is the time for seniors to enroll, and I sincerely hope all of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle will stand with me in commitment to helping our seniors access the medication they need to stay well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### THE CENTER CANNOT HOLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is doubtful that we can even accurately count the number of Iraqis who have died today in their country. The President vows he will stay the course. We have heard this before over and over again, as if saying it repeatedly would alter the reality.

For months the American people have spoken with an ever louder voice urging the President to redeploy U.S. soldiers to get them out of harm's way. For months, many Members of Congress, especially Mr. MURTHA of Pennsylvania, have urged the President to redeploy the U.S. soldiers to get them out of harm's way.

Now even U.S. soldiers overwhelming say that the U.S. should be out of Iraq this year. In military terms, that is enough time to quickly plan and safely reallocate U.S. soldiers. In other words, the men and women of the United States Armed Forces, those in the battlefield, are saying what this administration refuses to act on.

The ground the President is standing on has shrunk to the size of a postage stamp. His approval ratings have fallen so low they are below sea level. Today, not only is Iraq in the throes of relentless civil violence, even members of the administration are telling Congress that there is danger the violence in Iraq could spill outside the borders and inflame the entire Middle East.

Yet despite the warnings, despite the reality, despite the Iraqi leaders urging

the U.S. to stop interfering with efforts to form a new government, the President is going to stay the course.

The same rhetoric spoken after every wave of violence has really worn threadbare. It is time to set a course, and we have done that. It is time to lead the U.S. out of harm's way because that is what leaders do.

Another U.S. soldier died today in Iraq. The total number of U.S. men and women serving this country in Iraq who have died has climbed to 2,292. They have paid the ultimate sacrifice for Bush's folly. In my judgment, the price they paid was too high. These soldiers are heroes. That much we know. And that is of comfort to their families and this proud and grateful Nation.

But we owe these heroes more than comfort for their families. Many of these soldiers died saving other soldiers. We have to ask ourselves whether we are failing as a Nation because we know Iraq is not working, and yet we leave the soldiers in harm's way.

We have to ask ourselves whether we are failing as a Nation because we allow our government to act contrary to the wishes of the people. This is supposed to be a democracy. This is not about a war time when only the Commander in Chief can know everything there is to know, and we must place our trust in him or her. This is not the Invasion of Normandy.

The war in Iraq is nothing like that. We know what the President knows about the situation. There are no secret intelligence reports laying out the real Iraq story. We know it. We see it on television. We read about it in the newspapers, and we discuss it online. We are truly all in this war. Everyone, except the man who lives at 1600 Pennsylvania. There is not a shred of evidence or paperwork that he has that says repeating the line, "stay the course," is going to benefit the U.S. or the Iraqi people.

Why then are we doing it? It is time for the American people to demand that the President account for his actions and the lack of actions on the Iraq war. Iraq is reeling from its worst fear, the launch of a civil war.

U.S. soldiers are bunkered in their defensive positions. But why are they there at all? Many Iraqi leaders are beginning to blame the U.S. occupation for unleashing the evil, as they call it.

Every day that goes by, the reputation and credibility of our Nation bleeds a little more. That is nothing in comparison to the lost lives and shattered lives of thousands of U.S. soldiers and their loved ones. William Butler Yeats, the Noble Prize laureate who was a Senator in Ireland, said in a poem called "The Center Cannot Hold," it is the Second Coming. Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world, the best lack all conviction while the worst are full of passionate neat intensity.

When will we learn? When will this government listen to the people? The soldiers in battle and the people at home, they know what Iraq is and is

not. But two people, or maybe only one, in the White House have yet to learn it. But until they do, Iraq will be a price for which we witness relentless chaos that can be turned loose upon the whole world. We cannot stay the course when there is no course. The best thing is to come home.

Mr. President, give us a plan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DREIER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### DUBAI PORTS WORLD DEAL RISKS NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, my constituents in Minnesota and I are overwhelmingly opposed to the administration handing over day-to-day management of six U.S. ports to a company owned and operated by the United Arab Emirates.

Mr. Speaker, this port management deal poses a very real risk to national security, as many experts have pointed out. As the former Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security, Clark Ervin, said last week, "It is true that our Coast Guard would remain in charge of port security. But that means merely setting standards that ports are to follow and reviewing their security plans. Meeting those standards every day is the job of port operators. They are responsible for hiring security officers, guarding the cargo and overseeing its unloading."

As another security expert put it, you cannot separate port security from port management. Our ports are on the front lines of our homeland defense, and terminal operators play a key role. It is undisputed that under the contract to manage the six U.S. ports, Dubai Ports World would handle shipping arrivals, departures, unloading at the docks, and many other security-related functions.

The UAE-owned company would be responsible for keeping cargo containers secure from the time they are unloaded from foreign ships until the containers are taken away on trucks. In addition, terminal operators work with port security plans that contain sensitive security information.

They are responsible for securing the perimeter of the terminals and they conduct security training for dock workers.

Mr. Speaker, the fundamental question is this: Do we really want a company owned by a foreign government that has been a home base for terrorists, do we really want that company in charge of these functions? I think not.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, we also know the United States Coast Guard conducted an intelligence assessment of Dubai Ports World and its owners in the United Arab Emirates. As a result of that December 13, 2005 intelligence assessment, the Coast Guard warned: "There are many intelligence gaps concerning the potential for DPW assets to support terrorist operations that preclude the completion of a thorough threat assessment of the merger."

The intelligence assessment also stated: "The breadth of the intelligence gaps also infer potential unknown threats against the large number of potential vulnerabilities."

Mr. Speaker, this Coast Guard assessment raises serious questions on the overall security environment at DP World facilities, the background of some personnel and foreign influence on company operations.

As a cosponsor, Mr. Speaker, of H.R. 4807, authored by Chairman Peter King of our Homeland Security Committee, I strongly support this critical legislation that would allow Congress to block the ports deal following the current 45-day investigation.

Mr. Speaker, the security of our homeland must be our highest priority. That is why we need to pass this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WATERS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### PROBLEMS WITH THE DUBAI PORTS DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong concern about the Bush administration's agreement to allow a United Arab Emirates company, Dubai Ports World, to manage operations at several U.S. seaports, including the Port of Baltimore in my home State of Maryland.

Let me first emphasize that the United Arab Emirates is a valued ally in the war against terrorism, and I sincerely appreciate their contribution to the war effort.

Unfortunately, some pundits and supporters of this deal suggest that bipartisan criticism of the port deal stems from racism or xenophobia or even political-year grandstanding. I reject these arguments. These are the same pundits who were quick to say that Congress was lax in its oversight and failed to connect the dots after a terrorist attack.

The sole issue here is national security and connecting the dots before the facts. Let me be clear. I do not oppose foreign ownership or operation of U.S.

ports, per se. However, I do think that in any case of foreign ownership or operation of sensitive U.S. assets, we need to scrutinize these deals that could threaten our national security.

That should have happened in this case. In cases involving foreign ownership and national security, the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States provides for a second-level 45-day security review.

Despite concerns expressed by the Department of Homeland Security and the Coast Guard, that did not occur. Only now, after this controversy has erupted, has the administration agreed to review the deal. Why are both Democrats and Republicans raising objections?

Here are the facts that give us pause: first, the United Arab Emirates honors an Arab boycott of Israel, thereby discriminating against a valued U.S. friend and ally. Second, al Qaeda used the bank system in the United Arab Emirates to execute the 9/11 and the 1998 African Embassy bombings.

Third, the United Arab Emirates was one of three countries that recognized Afghanistan's brutal Taliban regime.

Four, the 9/11 Commission reports indicated that Osama bin Laden regularly met with United Arab Emirates officials in the camps in Afghanistan. Reports suggest that bin Laden may have, in fact, been tipped off by friends in the United Arab Emirates.

Simply put, the United Arab Emirates' record on terrorism is in fact mixed at best, and serious questions need to be asked about whether this company should be allowed port management.

Let us talk about specific concerns. Last week Joseph King, a former Bush administration official at Customs, said in a Washington Post interview that people's national security fears about the deal are well grounded.

He goes on to point out that under the deal, this company would have carte blanche-like authority to obtain hundreds of visas to relocate managers and other employees to the United States. Using appeals for solidarity or even threats of violence, al Qaeda operatives could force low-level managers to provide these visas to al Qaeda sympathizers.

According to recent articles in a December 13, 2005, intelligence assessment of the company and its owners, the United Arab Emirates, by the Coast Guard warned: "There are many intelligence gaps concerning the potential for Dubai Ports World or P&O assets to support terrorist operations that preclude" the completion of a thorough threat assessment.

□ 1630

"The breadth of the intelligence gaps also infer potential unknown threats against a large number of potential vulnerabilities." That should give us pause.

Additionally, the Department of Homeland Security initially objected

to this deal. What are these intelligence gaps? How big are they? Have they been resolved? All questions we cannot answer right now.

Let me say this. The administration's announcement of this deal is chillingly akin to the administration's prewar intelligence on weapons of mass destruction. There the administration selectively tailored intelligence to support the invasion that it desired from the very beginning. Here, the administration seems to be ignoring, deliberately ignoring, red flags and cherry-picking positive intelligence to support approval of a ports deal that it already wants.

Let me conclude. Thankfully, Congress has put the brakes on this deal. We will be taking a long, serious and hard look at this arrangement. Unfortunately, the Bush administration has already made up its mind to support the deal even before a serious review has begun, and that is not in the best interest of the United States.

#### OPPORTUNITIES FOR AMERICAN COMPANIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, this Dubai ports deal will probably go through even though these types of contracts should be given to American-owned companies. But the deal will probably be approved with Congress passing some meaningless, feel-good limitations or restrictions and increasing funding for port security.

The deal will probably go through because, one, it involves \$6.8 billion and it is almost unheard of to stop a deal involving big money like that.

Secondly, the President and the entire administration are pushing it as hard as they can.

Third, the columnists and commentators are all piling on using words like "overreaction, racism and bigotry." Even though this is name-calling, rather than discussing the merits, most elected officials are going to do anything possible to avoid being called a racist or bigot or even that they are overreacting.

There are legitimate national security concerns here. The United Arab Emirates may be a strong ally now, but these things change. Our government considered Saddam Hussein as an ally all through the 1980s and supported him in a big way monetarily and in other ways.

While I am concerned about national security, my main concern about this deal is economic. We have far too many foreign companies operating our ports. These are some of the best and most lucrative contracts we have. They should be going to American-owned companies. If we give all these lucrative, big-money contracts to foreign-owned businesses, most of the profits and most of

the top jobs will go to people from those countries. At some point we need to start putting our own businesses and shareholders and workers first. After all, the first obligation of the U.S. Congress should be to the American people.

It is also of some concern that this deal is not with a private company, but with an organization owned or controlled by the Government of the United Arab Emirates. Let me emphasize, I have nothing whatsoever against anyone from any foreign country. I am certainly not anti-Arab. I think it is sad that a British-owned company was running these port operations, and I am not anti-British. I think we should be friends with the Arabs and the British, and I believe we should have trade with all countries. But I would want foreign countries to be buying things from American companies and vice versa. And I would like to see American ports, which are some of the most important infrastructure assets we have, to be run and controlled but American companies and American citizens.

I do not believe the Chinese or the Japanese or many other countries would let us run their ports. And most of these contracts to operate businesses on these ports are not advertised widely at all. Most are sweetheart, insider-type deals. I believe there are many American business people who would jump at the chance to do this business if they just knew about these opportunities.

Let us start putting our own people first once again and stop giving all this port business to so many foreign companies or especially not to foreign governments.

#### SECURING OUR NATION'S PORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say that in committee today we had the U.S. Coast Guard, and I want to commend them because after 9/11, they were the first agency within minutes to be on guard, guarding our bridges. And, in fact, after Katrina they were there and they did a yeoman's job. In fact, out of Homeland Security, FEMA, and the other agencies, it is the Coast Guard that really does a good job.

The administration's decision to allow the state-owned Dubai Ports to take over six major U.S. ports has bought the issue of port security to the forefront of national attention. Since September 11, in fact, I have been lobbying the Bush administration for additional security funds for our Nation's ports and other areas of our Nation's infrastructure, such as freight and passenger rail, our subway systems, buses, tunnels and bridges. They also need security.

To me, this funding is particularly needed in my State of Florida whose 14

major ports serve as a key gateway into the United States. Moreover, these ports play a crucial role in transportation of ammunition, supplies and military equipment to our men and women fighting all over the world.

The Bush administration has been telling the American public that they are checking, let us say, about 4 percent of the cargo that comes into the ports. But, in reality, they are only checking the manifests that list the inventory of the ships.

Now, I think the American people are smart enough to know that if you are reading a piece of paper provided by the shippers and what is passing for port security in this Nation, then we are all in a lot of trouble.

In addition, the administration's concentration of terrorist prevention funds in only the aviation industry has jeopardized the safety of other modes of transportation as well. For example, TSA is spending \$4.4 billion alone on aviation security while only \$36 million, let me repeat, \$36 million is spent on all surface transportation security. And with respect to our Nation's ports, which serve as the main economic engine for many of the areas in which they are found, an attack would not only be extremely dangerous for the local citizens, but economically disastrous as well.

This is absolutely the wrong time for our government to make a decision that could give the impression of vulnerability in the security of our ports or our infrastructure system as a whole.

The increased attention on our Nation's security infrastructure has come to the surface on the heels of the possible Dubai sale. I hope that the mass resistance to the sale will at least bring a discussion of the importance of increasing funding for our Nation's infrastructure security in the near future.

In other words, security discussions should serve as a "stand up" for our Nation's security. I repeat, I hope this is a "stand up" for our Nation's security.

#### COUNTING VOTES CORRECTLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Speaker, today I want to share material prepared by former Ambassador William B. Jones to the nation of Haiti. He is currently the Johns Professor of Political Science at Hampden-Sydney College, which is located in the Fifth District of Virginia.

It is the opinion of Ambassador Jones and of myself that citizens of foreign countries illegally in the United States should not be counted to determine congressional representation nor for the Electoral College.

The Framers of our Constitution would not have sanctioned illegality as

a basis for determining congressional representation and certainly not in fixing the numbers of Presidential electors. The extensive debates on congressional representation were focused on slavery resulting in the three-fifths of a person rationale. It is ridiculous to assume that any of the Framers, given the tenor of their debate and their dedication to establishing a rule of law, would ever have considered allowing citizens of foreign countries illegally in the United States to play a role in determining control in the Congress and the election of the President. To assume otherwise would construe the Constitution as protecting and sanctioning illegality.

It was not until the post-Civil War amendments that the issue of defining citizenship arose. The 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments were drafted to redress the inequities of slavery. They were never intended to give blanket sanctions to illegality. "Persons," as used in those amendments, clearly were intended to mean persons who were legally in the country.

It would be ridiculous to assume that the Framers of those amendments, which were intended to safeguard the rights of former slaves or who had been in the country since its founding, intended in any way, shape or form to sanction illegality. The purpose was to enshrine a legal concept of equality, not to twist that concept to sustain, support, sanction or condone illegality.

Once it is determined that the Constitution cannot be used to sanction, authorize, protect or promote illegality, the issue is, what is the remedy to correct the wrongs that have been done to our system of determining congressional representation in fixing the numbers of the Electoral College?

As every citizen has the right to fair and equitable representation and to know that his or her vote is of the same weight as that of any other citizen, then any citizen who has lost representation as a result of the counting of citizens of foreign countries illegally in the United States for the purposes of congressional and electoral representation has standing and can bring action to redress the grievance.

Also, and perhaps most important, States that have lost congressional seats and have had their electoral vote reduced as a result of the counting of citizens of foreign countries illegally in the United States may have standing to bring action to redress their grievance. It is quite possible that a fair evaluation of the results of counting citizens of foreign states illegally in the United States would actually show that in States that have had their congressional and electoral power increased, there may have actually been an outflow of U.S. citizens and the entire increase in their political power is due to the influx of citizens of foreign countries illegally in this country.

Therefore, a constitutional amendment may not be necessary to redress the inequalities caused by citizens of

the United States by counting of citizens of foreign countries illegally in the United States for purposes of apportioning congressional and electoral college members.

The Framers of our Constitution, in their great wisdom, enshrined the rule of law into our highest compact. To ignore the rule of law and to allow its subversion to shift and determine political power is totally contrary to the intent of the Framers of the Constitution and of the Framers of the Civil War amendments.

The practicality of determining accurate numbers for congressional and electoral representation is not a deterrent. Modern technology provides many ways of assessing numbers. In fact, almost on a daily basis the number of persons who are citizens of foreign countries illegally in the United States is estimated. Demographics, residential patterns, linguistic realities make it relatively simple to accurately determine numbers and redress the inequities that have resulted in accepting and even supporting illegality.

The fact that those persons may pay some taxes is not relevant and nothing in the Constitution lists payment of taxes as a guarantor of the right to be counted for the purpose of fixing congressional and electoral representation.

The Constitution does insist that political power be equitably divided among the States and no State should have advantage based on illegality.

States have an obligation to protect and defend the rights of their citizens. Those states that have lost Congressional seats and Electoral College votes should bring appropriate legal action to ensure the equitable and constitutional distribution of political power. The United States Supreme Court should be ultimate determiner of the meaning and intent of the Constitution not the Census Bureau.

#### RECOGNIZING THE DAY OF REMEMBRANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 64th anniversary of the Day of Remembrance, a day that commemorates the signing of Executive Order 9066 on February 19, 1942, by President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Executive Order 9066 authorized exclusion and internment of all Japanese Americans living on the West Coast during World War II. Rather than focus on the plight of Japanese Americans in this country during World War II, I would like to place the internment experience into a broader historical context.

□ 1645

Our Nation has always battled the dual sentiments of openness and freedom, on the one hand, and fear and apprehension of perceived outsiders on the other.

Giving into fear and apprehension, in 1798 the Alien and Sedition Acts were enacted by the federalist-controlled Congress, allegedly in response to hostile actions of the French Government. In actuality, these laws were designed to destroy Thomas Jefferson's Republican Party, which had openly expressed its sympathies for the French revolutionaries.

Contrary to our notions of freedom, the Alien Act and the Alien Enemies Act gave the President the power to imprison or deport aliens suspected of activities posing a threat to the national government or the national security.

Undermining our belief in openness, the Sedition Act declared that any treasonable activity, including the publication of "any false, scandalous and malicious writing," was a high misdemeanor, punishable by imprisonment.

Later, almost predictably, when the economy in this country took a downturn in the 1880s, the Asian community became the target of politicians looking for someone to blame. In 1882, Congress passed the Chinese Exclusion Act to keep out all people of Chinese origin.

During World War II, Japanese Americans were the well-known target of the government's submission to fear, apprehension, and greed.

Also, during this time, which is not very well-known, 10,000 Italian Americans were forced to relocate, and 3,278 were incarcerated while nearly 11,000 German Americans were incarcerated.

German and Italian Americans were restricted during World War II by government measures that branded them enemy aliens and required identification cards, travel restrictions, seizure of personal property as well.

In the post-9/11 world, we need to protect our Nation and our civil liberties more than ever.

I am concerned that rather than learn from our past we are progressively weakening our civil liberties for tokens of security as evidenced by the PATRIOT Act, the NSA wiretapping, and our treatment of so-called "enemy combatants" in Guantanamo. These are just a few of today's troubling trends.

Mr. Speaker, we live again in a time of fear and apprehension. Our civil liberties have not been as threatened since World War II. As political leaders, it is our duty to uphold constitutional principles.

Let us remember what Benjamin Franklin said during his time of fear and apprehension. He said, Those who would give up a little bit of security, a little bit of liberties for a little bit of security deserve neither.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WELDON of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear

hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### STRAIGHT TALK ON EDUCATION

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I had the honor and privilege of being selected as chairman of the 21st Century Competitiveness Subcommittee on the Education and Workforce Committee, which has jurisdiction over higher education.

I am here to give the American people some straight talk about higher education. Some have said we might have cut financial aid for college students. The truth is we have expanded access to college for our neediest students through the record growth of the Pell grant program.

Pell grants are the foundation of Federal student aid. As someone who attended college with the help of Pell grants and as chairman of the Pell Grant Caucus, I know how important they are for our Nation's low-income students.

Since I was elected to Congress in 2000, Pell grant funding has increased by 74 percent, from \$7.6 billion to \$13.2 billion today. The maximum grant has gone from \$3,300 in 2000 to \$4,050 today, the highest level in the program's history. The number of students receiving Pell grants has increased from 3.9 million in 2000 to 5.5 million today. We have paid down the Pell grant shortfall and secured this great program for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, the straight talk is that Pell grants are helping more students go to college than ever before. My colleagues on both sides of the aisle realize that a first-class education is a child's passport out of poverty.

As chairman of the 21st Century Competitiveness Subcommittee, I will fight to make sure that all children, rich or poor, have the opportunity to go to college and realize their American Dream.

I look forward very much to working with my Democratic and Republican colleagues in a bipartisan manner to make higher education better for all of our students in the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. INSLEE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### HONORING BUCK O'NEIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to first yield 1 minute to my colleague from Kansas (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed this week that Buck O'Neil of Kansas City was not inducted into the Hall of Fame of baseball.

Buck O'Neil was in the Negro Baseball League as a player and a manager for more than 17 years. Buck taught the people of the Kansas City metropolitan region about the importance of determination and resolve, sometimes in the face of hostility. Buck taught us about baseball; but more importantly, Buck taught us about life.

He is a wonderful role model, and I thank him for his contributions to baseball, to the Kansas City metropolitan region, and to the United States of America.

Buck O'Neil, you are a great American and a gentle man. You will always be a charter member of the Kansas City Hall of Fame.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, this week Kansas City and our entire metropolitan area celebrated our hometown hero, Buck O'Neil, a Hall of Famer in our hearts. It is clear that the baseball Hall of Fame has made a terrible, shameful error in not inducting Buck on this ballot. As one of the Hall's own officials said, "The Hall of Fame is not complete without Buck O'Neil."

Buck is the reason 17 members of the Negro Leagues will be inducted this summer. Without his national visibility as an ambassador of the Negro Leagues, they would not have this honor. Without his efforts, very few would know the intimate details of segregated baseball in the United States during the 1930s, 1940s, and even into the 1950s.

Buck, the classy man that he is, will never complain about not being elected to the Hall. In fact, when told by reporters that he had not made it, he smiled and said, "That's the way the cookie crumbles." And so, on behalf of a community in tears, and a 94-year-old baseball legend, I will stand and complain.

The omission of Buck O'Neil was wrongheaded and an insult to Buck, the Negro Leagues, and baseball fans everywhere. Buck O'Neil is a man who has done more than anyone to popularize and keep alive the history of the Negro Leagues. The fact that he was not voted into baseball's Hall of Fame is a wrong that only Major League Baseball can make right, and I hope they will make it right next year.

This humble man, who is careful not to slight, has, in fact, been slighted, apparently by a single vote, by a group who looked shortsightedly at his batting average, but not at what he has done for the game of baseball. There is one thing for sure: Buck's exploits on the baseball diamond were not steroid-aided. At a time when the game of baseball is in search of credibility,

there is a need for a living symbol of all that is good and wholesome about the sport. Who better than Buck O'Neil?

Think about the few people who would come to a baseball stadium and get excited about the opportunity to be near Buck O'Neil. If given an opportunity, Buck O'Neil could be one of the greatest ambassadors in the history of Major League Baseball.

It is rare that an entire community rallies around a single person; but our community loves Buck, what he stands for and his indomitable spirit. Once again, Buck O'Neil is teaching us that disappointments are to be cremated, not embalmed.

Buck's baseball career spans seven decades and has helped make him a foremost authority on baseball history and one of the game's greatest advocates.

I have never met a man who loves baseball and his community more than Buck O'Neil; but more than that, Buck loves life. And for that inspired love, Buck is adored by all those who know him and all who have heard him.

Literally hundreds of thousands of people have been touched by Buck's kind smile. He has traveled the country teaching children and adults about the Negro Leagues, baseball and life in general. Many of you may know his voice as the one in Ken Burns's documentary on baseball. We know him as the man you can find sitting behind home plate at Kansas City Royals baseball games talking to everyone who stops by to say hello.

As Kansas City's mayor, I was inspired by O'Neil to revitalize 18th and Vine, the historical center for black culture and life in Kansas City from the late 1800s to the 1960s. It was the hub of activity for African American homeowners, businesses, jazz and baseball enthusiasts. One block from the district stands the Paseo YMCA building, which was built as a black YMCA in 1914. It served as a temporary home for baseball players, railroad workers, and others making the transition to big-city life.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to introduce a resolution calling for the commissioner of baseball to give a special recognition to Buck O'Neil at the All Star Game. I will nominate through a bill Buck O'Neil for the Congressional Gold Medal.

This week Kansas City and our entire community celebrates our hometown hero, Buck O'Neil—a Hall-of-Famer in our hearts. It is clear the Baseball Hall of Fame has made a terrible shameful error in not inducting Buck on this ballot. As one of the Hall's own officials said, "The Hall of Fame is not complete without Buck O'Neil."

Buck is the reason 17 members of the Negro League's will be inducted this summer. Without his national visibility as an ambassador of the Negro Leagues, they would not have this honor. Without his efforts, very few would know the intimate details of segregated baseball in the U.S. during the 1930's, 40's and even into the 1950's.

Buck, the classy man that he is, will never complain about not being elected to the Hall. In fact, when told he had not made it, he smiled and said, "that's the way the cookie crumbles." And so, on behalf of a community in tears, and a 94 year old baseball legend, I will stand and complain. The omission of Buck O'Neil was wrong-headed and an insult to Buck and baseball fans everywhere. Buck O'Neil is a man who has done more than anyone to popularize and keep alive the history of the Negro Leagues. The fact that he was not voted into Baseball's Hall of Fame is a wrong that only Major League baseball can make right, and I hope they make it right next year.

This humble man who is careful not to slight anyone has been slighted—apparently by a single vote—by a group who looked short-sightedly at his batting average, but not at what he has done for the game of baseball. There is one thing for sure, Buck's exploits on the field were not steroid aided. At a time when the game has become an American past-time in search of credibility, there is a need for a living symbol of all that is good and wholesome about the sport. Who better than Buck O'Neil?

Think about the fan appeal of Buck O'Neil, a bitterless black baseball legend visiting each major league ballpark during the upcoming season. He could attract African American youngsters back to the game, and in doing so, keep the game going for another generation.

It is rare that an entire community rallies around a single person, but our City loves Buck, what he stands for, and his indomitable spirit. Once again, Buck O'Neil is teaching us that disappointments are to be cremated, not embalmed.

Buck's baseball career spans seven decades and has helped make him a foremost authority on baseball history and one of the game's greatest advocates.

Buck joined the Kansas City Monarchs in 1938. He left the team to serve in the U.S. Navy in World War II. When he returned from the Philippines in 1943, Buck played and managed with the Monarchs until 1955. As a manager, Buck guided the team to five pennants and two Negro World Series titles. As the major leagues' first African-American coach, Buck signed Ernie Banks and Lou Brock to their first minor-league contracts with the Cubs.

I have never met a man who loves baseball and his community more than Buck O'Neil. But, more than that, Buck loves life. And for that inspired love, Buck is adored by all those who know him and all who have heard of him. Literally hundreds of thousands of people have been touched by Buck's kind smile.

He has traveled the country teaching children and adults about the Negro Leagues, baseball, and life. Many of you probably know him as the voice and face of Ken Burns's documentary on baseball. We know him as the man you can find sitting behind home plate at Kansas City Royals games talking to everyone who stops by to say hello.

As Kansas City's mayor, I was inspired by O'Neil to revitalize 18th & Vine—the historical center for black culture and life in Kansas City from the late 1800s–1960s. It was the hub of activity for African-American homeowners, business, jazz, and baseball enthusiasts. One block from the district stands the Paseo YMCA building, which was built as a black YMCA in 1914. It served as a temporary home for base-

ball players, railroad workers, and others making the transition to big city life in the Midwest. It was there that the Negro National League was founded in 1920.

The 18th and Vine Historic District is now home to the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum, where Buck O'Neil serves as Board Chairman. I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 227, which would designate the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum as America's National Negro Leagues Baseball Museum. It is the least I can do for Buck and all those great players who played magnificently and in many cases incomparably on segregated fields where their peerless talents were hidden from the nation.

Buck, a long time member of the Bethel AME church in Kansas City, has never been bitter about what happened to him and all the other Negro Leagues players, about the exclusion they felt. He acted out the beliefs of his faith. He has preached a superb sermon with his life. The best sermons are lived and not preached. His reaction to the news that he had not made it into the Hall was a Sunday school lesson in humility and love.

Buck O'Neil represents some of our most noble values: determination, dignity, humility and excellence. He is a pioneer and a trail-blazer throughout his life and illustrious career and demonstrates in his everyday actions that determination is the pathway to success.

Buck has said that all that matters to him is that he is in our Kansas City Hall of Fame, the Hall of Fame of those who know and care for him. On behalf of the millions of people who live around Kansas City I can say with absolute certainty—you are a Hall-of-Famer to us, Buck.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GILCHREST addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### HISTORY OF THE INTERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember a day that many Americans, loyal Americans and true patriots of this country rise to remember as well during the month of February.

February 19 marks an important day of remembrance for many Americans who remember the ravages of World War II and many Americans who suffered from the ravages of World War II.

February 19, 1942, is the year in which Executive Order 9066 was signed, and this was the order that called for the exclusion and internment of all Japanese Americans living on the west coast during World War II.

I wish to join with my colleague Mr. MIKE HONDA, and other of my colleagues who will speak today, to recognize the hard work and struggle of so many Americans who for years have been loyal to this country, who finally

were rewarded for their loyalty with the recognition they deserve for having served this country and having always considered it their love.

This year happens to mark the 25th anniversary of the 1981 hearings by the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians. This commission concluded in 1983 that the internment of Japanese Americans was a result of racism and wartime hysteria back in the 1940s.

Five years after publishing its findings, then-President Ronald Reagan signed the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 that provided an official apology and financial redress to most of the Japanese Americans who were subjected to wrongdoing and who were confined in U.S. internment camps during World War II.

Those loyal Americans were vindicated finally by the fact that we have never once found even a single case of sabotage or espionage involving a Japanese American during World War II. The Civil Liberties Act of 1988 was a culmination of half a century of struggle to bring justice to those whom it had been denied. I am proud that our Nation did the right thing.

But 18 years after the passage of the Civil Liberties Act, there still remains unfinished work to completely rectify and close this regrettable chapter in our Nation's history.

Between December 1941 and February 1948, approximately 2,300 men, women and children of Japanese ancestry became the victims of mass abduction and forced deportation from 13 Latin American countries to the U.S.

During World War II, the U.S. Government orchestrated and financed the deportation of Japanese Latin Americans to be used as hostages in exchange for Americans held by Japan. Over 800 individuals were included in two prisoner-of-war exchanges between the U.S. and Japan. The remaining Japanese Latin Americans were imprisoned in internment camps without the benefit of due process rights until after the end of the war.

□ 1700

Japanese Latin Americans were not only subjected to gross violations of civil rights in the U.S. by being forced into internment camps much like their Japanese American counterparts, but additionally, they were victims of human rights abuses merely because of their ethnic origin.

Today, I want to announce that I soon will be introducing legislation that will create a commission to study the relocation, internment, and deportation of Japanese Latin Americans. It is the right thing to do to affirm our commitment to democracy and the rule of law by exploring this unclosed chapter in our history.

Just 2 weeks ago, I had the privilege of joining with citizens in Los Angeles, in my home city, at the Japanese American National Museum to commemorate the Day of Remembrance.

This day, first observed in 1978 in Seattle, has become very important in the Japanese American community. It is a time to reflect, to educate, and to act.

As we meet today to remember and reflect on the tragedy that innocent people experienced during World War II, it is my hope our government will continue to strive to right any wrongs and to prove once again that the strength of our national values and our eye towards redemption will continue to guide us. A necessary first step to achieving this altruistic goal is swift passage of the legislation which I will soon be introducing.

Mr. Speaker, today we should remember because many Americans have.

#### THE DAY OF REMEMBRANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, 64 years ago, on February 19, 1942, tens of thousands of Japanese Americans were forcibly removed from their homes and communities in one of the great suspensions of liberty in our Nation's history. We recall the day President Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 as a Day of Remembrance. This was the day the constitutional rights of Japanese Americans and legal residents along the West Coast were suspended and they were incarcerated during World War II.

Families and communities were uprooted from the life they had known. This memory is actually quite bitter-sweet for me and my family. My grandparents and parents were uprooted from their communities, their lives, their homes, their businesses, despite the fact that they were American citizens. My parents actually met and married at the Poston Internment Camp, my birthplace. In fact, my father says that that was probably the only good thing that came out of that camp.

Growing up, my parents protected me from the experience they went through of having the loyalty they held for this Nation being questioned. And as I was growing up, my parents made a concerted effort to teach me to believe in this country and love this country despite what it did to them.

I shared this sense of patriotism with my husband, Bob, who despite spending his toddler years in a camp, grew up to have a staunch and steadfast belief in our country and our Constitution, including the ideals of justice and equality firmly embedded in both.

Because of the implications of this incarceration, my grandparents, my parents like Bob's and so many others of this generation, did not speak of their experience in the internment camp. It wasn't until my father was much older that this time period was brought up.

But this is an experience that we cannot allow to fade. The government at all levels was blinded by war, and it is imperative that we learn the lesson this moment in history has taught us, including this Nation's ability to recognize and acknowledge our mistakes.

As we mark this tragic anniversary, I hope every American will take this day to affirm their commitment to our Constitution and the rights and protections it guarantees for all of us.

#### CELEBRATING COMMUNITY: A TRIBUTE TO BLACK FRATERNAL, SOCIAL AND CIVIC INSTITUTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I just want to join my colleagues tonight, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) in reminding us of the terrible scar on our Nation's history: the internment of Japanese Americans. And I want to say to them that as an African American, as a person of color in our country, from California, that we join you in making sure that this body continues to remind the entire country that never again shall we allow such a gross violation of the human rights of any, any people in our country and throughout the world.

So thank you, Mr. HONDA and Ms. MATSUI, for once again allowing us to participate and reminding us of this great atrocity.

I want to also add tonight my voice to those of my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus in honoring an organization whose fight against the oppression and discrimination that all of us have felt in this country, whether we were directly victimized by it or not, it affected all of us, which gave birth to the modern-day civil rights movement, and that is the NAACP.

Today, this body unanimously passed H. Con. Res. 355, which was a bipartisan resolution honoring the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on their 97th anniversary. This is the largest and the oldest civil rights organization in our country.

Late last night, we concluded Black History Month by commemorating this month with activities led by the Congressional Black Caucus Chair, our great leader, Chairman MEL WATT, on the floor. But it was very late last night, and I hope people had an opportunity to listen to the few Members who were here to talk about the glorious history of African Americans in America.

Today, in keeping with the ideals of Black History Month and the tradition of our ancestors, we must recommit ourselves to a plan of action. For generations, the NAACP has provided the blueprint for organizing the African American community and other communities, communities of color,

throughout our country to build these coalitions for success.

In December, the House unanimously adopted my resolution recognizing the 140th anniversary of the 13th amendment. The abolition of slavery in 1865 should have been, should have been, a new day for African Americans. Yet 40 years later, African Americans continued to fight the repression and discrimination. It was this continued frustration and pain that led to the birth of the modern civil rights movement.

In Ontario, Canada, in 1905, a group of African American leaders developed an action plan and launched the Niagara Movement. Emerging from the Niagara Movement the call was issued and diverse progressives formed the National Negro Committee, which soon developed into the NAACP. For almost 100 years, since that historic meeting, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has been the cornerstone of the social justice movement of minority communities.

Mr. Speaker, last year, Mr. Hilary Shelton, the Director of the NAACP's Washington Bureau, delivered a Black History Month speech to the Federal Aviation Administration, the following excerpt of which outlines the development of the NAACP.

From 1905 through 1910, an organization of African American intellectuals led by W.E.B. Du Bois and calling for full political, civil, and social and civil rights for African Americans. This stance stood in clear contrast to the accommodation philosophy proposed by Booker T. Washington in the Atlanta Compromise of 1895. You see, the Niagara Movement was the forerunner of the NAACP. In the summer of 1905, 29 prominent African Americans, including Du Bois, met secretly at Niagara Falls, Ontario, and drew up a manifesto calling for full civil liberties, abolition of racial discrimination, and recognition of human brotherhood, a forerunner to the United Nations U.N. Declaration of Human Rights. Subsequent annual meetings were held in such symbolic locations as Harpers Ferry, W.Va., and Boston's Faneuil Hall.

Despite the establishment of 30 branches and the achievement of a few scattered civil-rights victories at the local level, the group suffered from organizational weakness and lack of funds as well as a permanent headquarters or staff, and it never was able to attract mass support. After the Springfield (ILL.) Race Riot of 1908, however, white liberals joined with the nucleus of Niagara "militants" and founded the NAACP the following year. The Niagara Movement disbanded in 1910, with the leadership of Du Bois forming the main continuity between the two organizations.

DuBois and the many other brave men and women of the Niagara Movement to the reigns of the challenges of there day to lead the Niagara movement and now the NAACP, we too must rise up to take on the challenges of our generation.

Founded on February 12, 1909, the NAACP's diverse founders, Ida Wells-Barnett, W.E.B. DuBois, Henry Moscowitz, Mary White Ovington, Oswald Garrison Villiard, and William English Walling, understood the importance of organizing and motivating people. Currently headed by Julian Bond and the President and CEO, Mr.

Bruce Gordon, the NAACP exemplifies a movement that has transcended race, class, and generations in the fight for equal rights for African Americans and all disenfranchised people.

The focus of the NAACP has always been working to build coalitions for equality and opportunity in the United States. However, they never forget to advocate for Africans throughout the Diaspora. In Washington, D.C., the NAACP's Legislative Bureau mobilizes communities on issues from the fiscal year 2007 budget shortfalls, to equal opportunity, to the importance of an independent judiciary and racial profiling. Every session, the NAACP's D.C. Bureau outlines what issues and legislation will impact minority communities both here in the United States and abroad. Their vigilance is a constant reminder of how much work there is to do.

Recently, the NAACP's priorities have been rebuilding the gulf coast in the wake of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, and addressing disparity in wealth, housing, and basic social services. That is the tragedy that unfolded, that we witnessed and which was exposed as a result of this tragedy of Katrina and Rita.

Also, the NAACP is very committed to reauthorizing the Voting Rights Act, the culmination of a movement that took blood, sweat, tears, and lives, and the sacrifices of those who came before us. This is set to expire next year.

They are committed to reforming our prison system, where our country has the largest prison population in the world. This is especially important since six in ten of those persons are people of color.

So let me just congratulate the NAACP on the 97th anniversary of this institution, and I urge everyone to use this occasion to recommit themselves to the struggle for freedom, justice, and peace.

WASHINGTON BUREAU, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,

Washington, DC, February 28, 2006.

Representative BARBARA LEE,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LEE: On behalf of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), our Nation's oldest, largest and most widely-recognized grassroots civil rights organization, I am urging you, in the strongest terms possible, to reject provisions in President Bush's proposed budget for 2007 and instead pass a budget plan that supports and encourages low- and middle-income Americans. A Nation's budget reflects its priorities; our willingness ability to care for the sick and elderly, educate the young, protect our surroundings, respond to natural emergencies and protect those less fortunate. The budget proposal put forth by President Bush for fiscal year 2007 does not reflect the priorities of, nor does it serve the governmental needs, the majority of Americans. Rather, the President's proposal would benefit the wealthiest Americans while short-changing low- and middle-income Americans and saddling future generations with a debilitating deficit.

I urge you to demonstrate the necessary leadership skills and to work with your colleagues to develop a budget proposal that ensures that the basic needs of all our citizens are met. This means rejecting the cuts in federal funding for education, health care, job training, small business promotion, the protection of our basic civil rights and liberties and energy assistance. This also means rejecting the President's proposed tax cuts, which have been proven to mostly benefit only the wealthiest Americans and cripple our ability to address some of the most basic needs of our society while at the same time ballooning our deficit.

Although a majority of the Administration's proposed cuts or program eliminations are problematic for the NAACP, we are especially troubled by the provision in the budget to reduce funding for the crucial work of the EEOC. The President's budget for 2007 includes a cut in funding of the EEOC Budget from \$333 million to \$323 million, most of which would be taken from State and local operations. State and local enforcement agencies handle about 42 percent of the total Title VII caseload, yet, they are being asked to take 60 percent of the budget cut. Because enforcement of civil rights laws is a key element of the strategic goals and initiatives of the NAACP, we are especially troubled by these proposals.

Again, on behalf of the millions of NAACP members and friends of civil rights across this Nation I hope that you will work hard to see that the values of supporting our young, our ill and our elderly as well as those less fortunate are addressed in this year's budget. I look forward to working with you to ensure that the needs of all Americans are met. Thank you in advance for your attention to the concerns of the NAACP.

Sincerely,

HILARY O. SHELTON,  
Director.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4167, NATIONAL FOOD UNIFORMITY ACT OF 2005

Mr. GINGREY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-381) on the resolution (H. Res. 702) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4167) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for uniform food safety warning notification requirements, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MCKINNEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

□ 1715

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to address the House once again. We would like to thank the Democratic leadership, Leader PELOSI, and also Mr. STENY HOYER, Democratic whip, Mr. JAMES CLYBURN, who is our chairman, and our vice chairman and also our steering committee that is working towards making sure that we head in the right direction as Americans.

Working in a bipartisan way, I think, is very, very important for the development of our country; and I had an opportunity to talk to our vice chair, Mr. LARSON, a little earlier today, and he was very excited about hopefully, maybe in this second stage of the 109th Congress, Mr. Speaker, we can work in a bipartisan way on behalf of the American people.

As you know, the 30-something Working Group comes to the floor every time we get an opportunity to come to the floor to talk about issues that are facing everyday Americans and projects that we should be working on in a bipartisan way. We also share not only with the Members but with the American people our efforts on this side, being in the minority here in this body, being a few numbers behind the Republican numbers here that are Members of this House, of how we would govern, how we would stand on behalf of the American people, how we would make sure that those individuals that punch in every day to go to work and know what it means to take a 15-minute break in the morning and one in the afternoon and a solid 30 minutes of lunch, if they get that; and to give voice to those seniors and those veterans that have served our country.

We said we would uphold the commitment to them of lifelong health care and making sure that we are there for them, because they have allowed us to salute one flag today, Mr. Speaker. Those individuals that are getting sand in their teeth right now, our men and women in uniform right now in Iraq and Afghanistan and other parts of the world, the Horn of Africa, as we start working this effort against terrorism, I think it is important we give voice to them; the families that are looking for how they are going to make ends meet on their health care needs.

On this side of the aisle we have many proposals that are stuck in committee, Mr. Speaker, and also proposals that will never see the light of day on this floor. Not because there is not a great effort on this side, not only in the area of ideas, but forward-leaning, hard facts of how we can provide health care for not only small businesses to offer to their employees, but also for individuals that would like to make sure their children can grow up healthy.

So I feel very good, Mr. Speaker, about the position of the Democratic Caucus within the House. The American people feel very good about it, and I think it is important that we allow the American people to see an opportunity for us to work in a bipartisan way.

Last time I was on the floor, Mr. Speaker, along with Mr. RYAN and Mr. DELAHUNT, we talked about the House Democrats innovation agenda. And in that agenda we talk about broadband access for all Americans, not just for some Americans. We talk about the fact that we need more scientists and math teachers in our classrooms, and that is going to be accomplished within a short period of time.

We also gave quotes from private sector company presidents and CEOs that are literally begging this Congress to move forward as it relates to our agenda and innovation. We talk about innovation. We are talking about preparing not only this generation, but the next generation to not compete against the next county, not compete against the next state, not even competing with one another as it relates to Americans, but to make sure that America stays ahead of or parallel to other countries and what they are doing.

There is a great deal of frustration out there, Mr. Speaker, of many Americans that are concerned about the fact that they cannot get a job. They try to train themselves. They try to educate themselves, but they cannot get a job because we are bringing individuals over from other countries to be able to fill those jobs because we have not stepped up to the plate to incentivize economically many of the citizens of the United States of America to be able to afford the education they need to rise to the occasion that many of these companies call for.

Competition is fierce, and the last thing that we should be doing, especially in this budget as we look at it and, Mr. Speaker, we are going to talk a little bit about the budget too today. But as we start looking at the decisions that are made here in Washington, D.C., it brings about a great deal of frustration on behalf of many of us here, especially on the Democratic side of the aisle.

I could say some of my colleagues on the Republican side, just a few of them, are very concerned with the direction that the Republican majority is taking us.

Now, we talk a lot about "leadering up," making sure that we do what our constituents sent us up here to do. They did not send us up here to create a K Street project. They did not send us up here to be able to have the President's back as it relates to special port deals. They sent us up here to represent them. And I think it is important that they get their votes' worth.

And I think it is also important for the American people to pay very close attention, and I do mean very close at-

tention, because if the 30-something Working Group has anything to do with it, Mr. Speaker, I mean we want to reveal all of the secrets that may be held in the dark halls of Congress that may have a reverse effect on what the American people have asked for out of its government.

And I think it is important also that we give light to the democratic ideas, which should be bipartisan ideas, but we know that the majority party has not accepted a bipartisan spirit on many efforts that we are pushing for as it relates to health care, many efforts that we push for as it relates to the budget, the direction this country is going to go financially. Many of the issues as it relates to education and, in some instances, as it relates to foreign policy, as it relates to our troops, as it relates to those families that are here, also as it relates to veterans. So there are a number of issues that we should be coming together on that we are prepared to work on.

We have legislation on this side of the aisle to increase transparency as it relates to the legislative process and how we function ethically here within this House. But there is not a bipartisan spirit at this time to be able to genuinely move forward in a way that we can give the American people what they need.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I hold up almost, I would call, an executive copy of the Democratic side Innovation Plan. This is not a plan that, the ink is pretty dry on this plan. It has been around for 3, 4 months, and it has been in the works for a very long time now. It is not just Democratic ideas. They are American ideas to move us forward.

We ask and we challenge the Republican majority to do what we want to do. We wish that we could have this on the floor right now, and if we had anything to do with it as it relates to being in the majority of this House, we would perform just like we performed on the budget.

I would say that the Members can pick up a copy of this, if they want to get a copy of it, the American people too, at [www.HouseDemocrats.gov](http://www.HouseDemocrats.gov). You can download it. It is on a PDF file. You can feel free to take a look at it, and we look forward to hearing from many of you as it relates to how we can work together.

The President talked about innovation, but we have to do more than talk about innovation; we have to do something with it. The President's budget does not speak towards innovation.

Have you ever heard the saying, Mr. Speaker, You put your money where your mouth is? Well, in this case we are not putting our money where our mouth is. We are putting rhetoric where our mouth is. The Republican majority is in charge. They are also going to go through a long budget process. They say trust me, trust me, trust me.

Well, I think as it relates to how we iron out the facts here, Mr. Speaker in

the remaining time that we have, and I must say, Mr. RYAN will be back here claiming another hour in between for us to have an opportunity to really be able to drive this issue home.

Trust us: When you start talking about special port deals, until it was revealed to the American people, it was going to be business as usual here in Washington, D.C. And I can tell you that being from a city that one of these ports were going to be handed over to a foreign nation that has a checkered past it is working on and trying to improve its accountability in the effort against terrorism, I think it is important for us to remind ourselves that the ports, our ports especially, here in the United States, have a lot to do with our economic outcome. And I think it is also important to even reflect on how easy it is to allow foreign governments and foreign companies to have free rein in our country.

And I think it is important and it is disturbing to me as an American, let alone a Member of Congress, to see time after time, example after example of special deals, back-room talks, things that individuals would not even come out under the lights here on the floor to talk about until they have to. And the American people have spoken. They are concerned.

But what I am disturbed about, Mr. Speaker, Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. RYAN, I am concerned about the fact that the President is saying, Well, I have not changed my mind. I know there will be a 45-day review. The White House did release a statement saying that we agree that there should be a 45-day review.

Hello, Mr. Speaker. That is the law. And I think it is important for everyone to understand that making laws and carrying out what is on U.S. Code statutes, that it is important that we abide by it. I mean, oh, well, goodness, you mean to tell me we have to follow the law this time?

Mr. RYAN, I have been talking, maybe for the last 10 minutes about "trust us." We can run this government, we know how to run this government; that is what the majority is saying. But time after time, again, not just quietly here within the halls of Congress, but it is revealed to the American people. I am concerned about what else is going on that we do not know about right now.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Well, that has really been the problem here. And I thank the gentleman, and I want to congratulate you, as your partner down here at the 30-somethings, for your recent election to the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation as their chairman; and I want to congratulate you, only in your second term to receive that distinguished honor. But I agree with you 100 percent.

Mr. DELAHUNT. If the gentleman would yield for a moment.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I just also want to concur and extend my congratulations

to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK). That is a high honor and one that the gentleman is very worthy of; and those of us who belong to the 30-something group want to express our pride. Great job. We expect big things.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thanks to you both for your kind remarks.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Wait a minute. He did not yield to you.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, we are not going to focus on this right now.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. He did not yield to you.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I did not yield.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, let me just say this, because I do not want you to get too far off on that. I want to thank the board members of the foundation for seeing fit to allow me to do it. And we are going to continue to do the good things we have been doing.

We provide internship opportunities for African American kids to come to Capitol Hill, be exposed to something that, for generations, they were not exposed to. We provide fellowships to many of the folks in research, desperately needed research on health and a number of other issues. So there will be things that we will continue to do as we move on.

But thank you so much, gentlemen. I appreciate it. And I thank the board members and also the Members. Thank you.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Well, you are our guy.

But back to the reason we are here, the issue of "trust us." And all we have to do, really is look at the facts. And I really believe that the Republican majority, they may believe that they are actually doing the right thing. I do not think there is any malice. I do not think they hate people. I do not think they are bad people. Many of them on the other side are our friends.

What I do argue, Mr. Speaker, is that the Republican Party is void of any knowledge about how to execute government. And I believe they do not have the ideals necessary to advance this government and this country in the 21st century. They just do not have them. They are just stuck, I think, in an era that no longer exists. Their old phrases no longer apply to how society is today. And so all they have, quite frankly, Mr. MEEK, is to say, "Trust us."

But when we look at Katrina and the fact that there are 11,000 trailers sitting in Hope, Arkansas, worth \$300 million that are now in the mud because they did not know how to deliver them or they did not know where they went, or they did not know where they should go, meanwhile people are still homeless down there. That means you do not know how to administer government.

When you start a \$700 billion prescription drug program and you do not allow for any kind of negotiation down of the drug prices, that means you do not know how to execute government.

When you lose \$9 billion in Iraq and you get a Three Stooges routine that, you got it, I mean you got it, I mean Curly got it, no one knows where \$9 billion is, it is just example after example after example that this outfit does not know how to execute government.

And when you have spent, as the Republican majority has, the last 10 or 15 or quite frankly, since President Reagan, running down government, it does not work. Government is the problem. And then you actually need it, and the outfit who hates government doesn't know how to execute it in a way that is meaningful.

Mr. DELAHUNT. If my friend would yield.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. DELAHUNT. That is, I think, such a valid point. There was a recent interview by Brian Williams of ABC News with the former head of FEMA. Do you remember Mike Brown, also known as "Brownie" to President Bush?

Well, during the course of that interview, for the first time, I would suggest, there was much new information revealed by Mr. Brown. Do you remember when there was confusion as to when the President was first informed about the potential destruction of Hurricane Katrina? And the President claimed that, Well, he saw it for the first time on TV? Well, Mr. Brown has a totally different version of that particular scenario.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. DELAHUNT? Mr. DELAHUNT. Sure.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Maybe that version is different now since he is no longer on the payroll of the Department of Homeland Security. I do not know. Maybe.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Well, I think we have to obviously factor into the account that he was kept as a consultant after he was fired from the payroll, and he is now no longer on the payroll of the American taxpayer. So maybe that is part of the basis for his new-found candor.

But he claims that he had a conference call with President Bush and a variety of officials, both at the Federal, the State and the local level where he articulated his grave concern that in his gut this was going to be one of the most devastating natural disasters ever to be experienced in our history. And clearly, his gut was right on that particular occasion.

Let me just, if I may, for several minutes, just read excerpts of that particular interview. This is Brian Williams. I want to ask you, Why didn't you shout it from the mountain tops? Or do you feel that you did?

I told everybody in that conference, and this is Mr. Brown's response, the President, Chertoff, the State, New Orleans, my gut tells me this is the big one. I want to push everything forward as far as we can. I want to jam up supply lines. I want to cut bureaucratic red tape. I want to do everything that we can.

So what date did the President first hear your voice?

The first time was probably on Saturday before landfall, August 27. But the alarm bells were being sounded on Sunday, prior to landfall, because not only was I having conferences with the President on the telephone, but he was also on the videoconference with all of the State emergency managers, all of the Federal departments and agencies, and listened in to the entire conversation, including the Director of the National Hurricane Centers' warnings.

□ 1730

And so when we see trailers in Hope, Arkansas, and you made that allusion, Mr. RYAN, that some of them may not be fit for families anymore because of the rot that the weather has caused, whom do we get angry at?

First of all, you can get mad at me, said Mr. Brown, if you want, but I think we ought to get mad at Congress, we ought to get mad at the President, we ought to get mad at Secretary Chertoff. "I raised the flag, Mr. President, and I told you that FEMA was being marginalized."

Mr. RYAN, this absolutely segues into your observation that they have brought government agencies down to the point where they are now ineffective. They are practically incapable of delivering basic services in times of emergency.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And I just want to say to the gentleman, one, how much I agree with you. And two is we are not saying that government is the only answer in many situations. It is not. In many situations it needs to get out of the way. Maybe it does need to be a bit smaller. But it has responsibilities, and certain responsibilities are not being met under this administration because of an utter and total disrespect for government in general, and this outfit comes with the same old ideas that are not applicable today, and this is the kind of execution of government that you get. You get 11,000 trailers in Hope, Arkansas, with nowhere to put them.

Mr. DELAHUNT. But you asked, Mr. RYAN and Mr. MEEK, about the reaction of the White House to issues that ought to be part of our public discourse. And the response is "trust me."

How can we trust the executive branch when we have a former director that stands up now and says, Mr. President, on at least a couple of occasions and on numerous occasions to your staff, I raised the flag and told you that FEMA was being marginalized and was not going to be able to respond and, in fact, was on a path to failure. I told you so, Mr. President.

Where was the executive branch? Where was this Republican majority in terms of exercising its responsibility to oversee and to hold accountable executive agency performance? It was not there because this Republican majority, in its management of this Congress, has done nothing more than simply to rubber-stamp the administration's proposals.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. DELAHUNT, I can guarantee you this: on some given Tuesday morning about a year and a couple of months ago, I guarantee you that every last one of our constituents, if we had a sign out saying that we will rubber-stamp bad ideas, we would not be in Congress. We just would not be here. And time after time the Republican majority does it.

I mean, let us just get a rubber stamp. Staff, can we get a rubber stamp? I want to get a rubber stamp and the ink should be red, and it should say: We have the President's back no matter what. No matter what. If it puts our country in debt to other countries, no matter what. If it comes down to a lack of intelligence and putting our men and women in harm's way, no matter what, we are with the President. The American people, we will tell them something when it comes down to election time through marketing commercials, but we are here to serve the President.

I mean, that is what I am hearing from the majority side. Imagine, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, before I yield to you, if there was a Democratic President in the White House right now? Imagine. For far less this Congress, Mr. President, moved to impeach the President of the United States, for far less.

So, Mr. DELAHUNT, I am so glad that you took us through memory lane about what people have said, especially when it comes down to Mr. Brownie, whom we do not necessarily hold high up as a person that we take a great deal of input from, Mr. Brownie; but I think it is important that we understand exactly and spell out to the Members and the American people what they have said, what they are doing. And our purpose for being here is to say that, listen, a lot of this would not be going on if the oversight were there.

Mr. DELAHUNT. If we did not have a rubber-stamp attitude towards this administration in this Congress, believe me, we would be delivering a service to the American people that all of us could embrace.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I am a little out of practice with my word-in-edgewise with you guys.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We have missed you.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It is good to be back with my 30-something friends and to engage in this dialogue.

What we have been asking for months is, where is the outrage? Where was the outrage about issue after issue that has come to light since Hurricane Katrina wreaked the devastation that it did?

I mean, just by way of example, in the Davis committee report that was just issued, where were the top White House officials on the day Katrina struck? Now, we knew in advance of Katrina, and I live in south Florida, where the hurricane center is. We had days of watching Katrina approach the gulf coast. So it is not like we did not

know a category five hurricane was approaching the gulf coast. On the day Katrina struck, President Bush, we know, was on vacation in Crawford, Texas. Vice President CHENEY, a little known fact, was fly fishing at his ranch in Wyoming. This was on the day Katrina struck. Chief of Staff Andrew Card was vacationing at his lakefront summer home in Maine, and Homeland Security adviser Francis Townsend was also vacationing in Maine.

Now, why would they leave a relatively junior official in charge of the situation room in the White House when you have a cat five hurricane bearing down on probably what they knew, they knew, was the most vulnerable region in the country when it came to hurricane preparedness and what they knew would likely be the aftermath?

Why did President Bush and other top administration officials insist that the levees did not break until Tuesday when now we know, with the Davis report and with Mr. Brown's revelation, that he told them the day Katrina struck, the night that Katrina struck?

Mr. DELAHUNT. The day before, Debbie.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. They knew.

Mr. DELAHUNT. In his own words.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I know what the House rules are, and I know what they constrain us from doing, but they knew. And that is what Michael Brown testified. They knew. He told them. And now he is free from the constraints from working for the administration, and let us acknowledge that the four of us have been fairly critical of Mr. Brown. We meted out our own share of criticism of his performance. But now that he has been freed of his ties to the administration, and we all acknowledge that when you work for an administration, unfortunately, sadly, with this administration in particular, loyalty to your dying day is supposed to be the most valuable, particularly if they are continuing to sign your paycheck.

He made it clear when they were no longer signing his paycheck, 60 days after he was supposedly no longer with the Department, that he issued warning after warning to Secretary Chertoff, to the President. He indicated that he personally spoke with the President and told him that there was a levee break, that there was significant damage and he sounded the alarm bells. And the President was on vacation in Crawford, Texas. The Vice President was fly fishing in Wyoming. Homeland Security adviser Francis Townsend was in Maine, and his chief of staff was at home in Maine.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And they want us to trust them.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Trust them. They have got our back.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And a lot of what they were trying to say, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, was how were we to know. We found out they did know.

They were warned. And then not only were they warned, but they were spread out all over the country saying our responsibility is to execute this particular agency at this particular time and we should all be here. That is a level of incompetence that I think is unsurpassed.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Indifference, incompetence, corruption, cronyism, it is all a consistent pattern. One would think when they got hit hard in the face with the criticism and the visceral reaction of the American people in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina and the response to their indifference that they would learn. But now, no. They were not just surprised, but astonished at the American people's reaction to their indifference on this port deal. I mean, you go from one thing to the other. The indifference and the callous disregard for what the American people's needs are in terms of security in a natural disaster or a potential man-made disaster. Their indifference and insensitivity is just astonishing.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. How many times do we hear from our friends on the Republican side that government needs to run like a business, it needs to be flexible and this and that? This is an atrocity. This business would be bankrupt if you ran it the way we are running FEMA. If that was a business, it would be bankrupt. The war in Iraq, in that execution, the administration of that war, after we conquered Baghdad, that business would be bankrupt. It would go belly up.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And the execution of the Medicare prescription drug benefit, the so-called part D, what has occurred, let me suggest, is that the Republican Party in both this branch as well as in the White House, but particularly in the White House, has developed a habit, a habit of incompetence and a habit that could have been, in my judgment, interrupted and dealt with if we had aggressive oversight and accountability by Members of the House and Members of the United States Senate.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. No doubt.

Mr. DELAHUNT. But rather than doing that, when you speak to Democrats who are ranking members of full committees and subcommittees about conducting investigations, whether it be into energy, whether it be into the reconstruction of Iraq and the magnitude of corruption that is part and parcel of that reconstruction, the list goes on and on and on, and they say no. And that is why we are being embarrassed today. That is why someone like Michael Brown, the former head of FEMA, stands up and says, Mr. President, you have marginalized FEMA. We do not have the capacity to do it. I told you so. And yet not a word, not an agreement to work in a bipartisan fashion with Democrats to ensure that the mistakes that have been made are not replicated, are not continually being made to the detriment of the American people.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And for our friends in the business community, it is like having a board of directors or having shareholders. If the people running the business are not doing the job, Mr. MEEK, then the board of directors may have to make a decision. Well, the United States Congress, Mr. MEEK, is the board of directors.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. That is us.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That is our responsibility, to say if the executive branch is not executing their responsibilities the way they should, then we have to intervene and make some big-time decisions.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. And, Mr. RYAN, those decisions would be made if we had NANCY PELOSI as Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, if we had the Democrat leadership team.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. But what do we have?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. We have the Republican Congress, the Republican majority. We have the rubber stamp Republican Congress.

The staff is trying to find some red ink for me. They brought some black ink, but I need some red ink. We need to stamp this bigger. So I think we will get that by the end of the week.

□ 1745

But I think it is important, Mr. RYAN, that we point out to the American people and also to the majority that enough is enough. It is not their country, it is our country, it is all of our country. And the bottom line is we cannot sit idly by and let historians say some Members of Congress did not participate in trying to stop what is happening right now.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That is a great point. We will get criticism levied at us from the majority, saying how dare the 30-Somethings go out there night after night, sometimes 2 hours a night, and all they are is critical.

Wait a minute. Are you asking us to just sit by and let all this happen, and no one is providing a little sunlight on this? I hate to tell them, but Article I, Section 1 of the Constitution creates this body, Mr. MEEK, this body, and the problem I think with the majority in the House and in the Senate, the Republican majority in the House and in the Senate, is they are too coachable. They are too coachable, because the President coaches them, and he basically says "We need X, Y and Z," and it goes out and happens. They are too coachable.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. They have the desire and the will to be coached by this administration into a fiscal nightmare, and that is what has happened, and that is what is happening throughout.

Mr. RYAN, would you please get that chart, because I think it is time for us to really get into the nitty-gritty, because folks do not understand, Mr. Speaker, they just think, Mr. DELAHUNT, that the 30-Somethings, we

just kind of get together over a hot dog and a Diet Coke and say, Well, what are we going to say today? What are we going to share with Members today?

But, guess what, Mr. Speaker? We have third-party validators, and we have the facts here and we want to share that at this time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The execution of government includes a lot of different things, including how administrative agencies are run and Medicare and the prescription drug program are run. But the one issue that highlights the incompetence of the Republican majority and the Republican President is what we have been doing as far as our national debt and our annual deficits.

Now, this chart, and this is really one of the great charts, it is good, shows increases in the Federal debt in foreign borrowing. So way out here in the blue is the increase in the national debt from 2001 to 2005. Over \$1 trillion, \$1.18 trillion was the increase in the national debt just in the past 4 years. Of that debt, of that increase, \$1.16 trillion was borrowed from foreign sources, Mr. DELAHUNT. Right here.

You want to know how much we borrowed from U.S. interests, from domestic borrowing? Right here. \$0.02 trillion. I mean, we are mortgaging our future to foreign interests, the Japanese Government, the Chinese Government.

Mr. DELAHUNT. OPEC.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Thank you. We are no longer controlling our own destiny.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Isn't it ironic, if the gentleman would yield, that we speak about energy independence, and I think that there is a consensus that clearly it is in our national security to develop an energy program that weans us from being dependent on foreign sources of energy, with a particular focus on OPEC.

Well, I wonder if we can wean ourselves from borrowing tens of billions, hundreds of billions of dollars, from foreign sources like OPEC, like the Chinese, like the Japanese.

We have now created here in the United States, and I will utilize President Bush's phrase, an "ownership society." Well, the reality is that under his leadership, with the approval of this Congress, we have created an ownership society in the United States. Unfortunately, the owners are the Japanese, the Koreans, the Chinese and OPEC.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. OPEC.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. OPEC.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Because of the economic policies. So what do we gain? What do we gain from securing our independence in terms of energy and at the same time become increasingly reliant on other nations, including potential adversaries and competitors like China to provide subsidies for tax cuts?

To me, that makes no sense. We lose our political flexibility. We cede, I would suggest, some of our sovereignty when we allow ourselves to become borrowers from foreign nations.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. DELAHUNT, if you do not mind, I want to share another chart. This is the public debt held by China. One country, in 2000, they held \$62 billion. In 2005, they hold \$257 billion in public debt. This is when the President took office.

Now look at it. With the rubber stamp, Congress has just, time after time after time, continued to exacerbate this problem.

Now, look, in June of 2002, the Republicans increased the debt limit by \$450 billion. That means they are okaying the Treasury to go out and borrow more money. In May of 2003, they increased it again by another \$984 billion. In November of 2004, they did another \$800 billion. Now we have got a pending increase that we know is going to happen because this runaway train isn't getting stopped any time soon, another \$781 billion.

That is \$3 trillion in debt that the Republican House and Senate and Republican White House went out and borrowed from foreign countries.

Now, who is patriotic now? You want to call this patriotism, mortgaging the future of the country to the Japanese and Chinese Governments and—

Mr. MEEK of Florida. OPEC.

Again, Mr. RYAN, it is just amazing. I want to put my Secretary of Treasury's picture up, Mr. John W. Snow. Like I say, he is an accountant type of figure within our government. We appreciate his service to our country, appointed by the President, confirmed by the Senate.

You know, you have seen this letter before about where Secretary Snow wrote one of our respected Senators on the other side basically saying, "I will be unable to continue to finance government operations if we don't raise the debt ceiling." It said, "Currently the limit is \$8.184 trillion, and we will breach that by February 2006."

Well, the month of February has passed, and, guess what? We got another letter right here dated February 16, 2006, to the Honorable Ranking Member JOHN SPRATT on the Democratic side on the Budget Committee. This is what it says. I am going to read it slowly.

On December 29, Mr. RYAN, that is this letter right here, I want to make sure the Members see it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. This was last year.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. This was actually the 29th. Mr. Speaker, on the 29th of December, I was back in Miami with my family. We were finished polishing off what was left over from Christmas dinner, what have you, looking forward to New Year's. You all were doing the family thing.

But that letter was written saying we need to raise the debt ceiling, when no one was paying attention.

Now it comes down to, "On December 29, I wrote the Congress regarding the need to increase the statutory debt limit. Because the debt limit has not risen, I must inform the Congress, pur-

suant to 5 U.S.C. 8438(h)(2) that in my determination, by reason of the public debt limit, I will be unable to fully invest in the Government Security Investment Fund, called the G Fund, of the Federal Employees Retirement System in special interest-bearing Treasury securities beginning on February 16."

Mr. RYAN and Mr. DELAHUNT, this letter was written on February 16. So that means that the Secretary, Mr. Snow, had to suspend. He waited until the last day. He didn't say in 2 weeks I am going to have to suspend payments to the G Fund, which is the retirement system for Federal employees. He waited until the day he could no longer wait any longer to write this letter. He is informing the Congress on that day.

The statute governing the G Fund explicitly authorized the Secretary of Treasury to suspend the investment to the G Fund to avoid breaching the statutory debt limit.

Now, let me just tell you, he goes on and on and on. But the bottom line is, gentlemen, that the Secretary now has to exercise his statutory authority to freeze payments to the G Fund.

I want to just say to the Federal employees, because some of them work here in this building, within this Congress, he goes on in the second paragraph saying, "We can replenish it when you raise the debt ceiling."

I want to tell you something, and I want to let the Secretary know on behalf of the Republican Congress, even though I am a Democrat, if we were in charge, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't have to ink up this rubber stamp, and I am going to do it on behalf of the Republican majority and just go ahead and rubber-stamp it for him, because, guess what? That debt ceiling is going to be raised.

I guarantee you, just like before, in the past, every Democrat will vote against raising that debt ceiling, because it will be giving our country away to other countries financially. That seems to not be a value of the Republican majority.

I just want to point something out. I have already read this letter.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, if my friend would yield for just 1 minute. What if one day those nations that are purchasing and buying our bonds, our Treasury notes, Treasury bills, for some reason they decided, maybe because of some political reason, they decided not to purchase in the financial markets American debt instruments? What would happen to our economy? Does anybody have that answer? I mean, I have my own theories, but I am not sure. Could they come over and foreclose? I wonder what they would do.

Now, here is Red China. Red China. It is kind of ironic when you think of Red China, and here we are piling up this red ink, Red China piling up red ink and it is all American red ink. And in 5 years, we have gone from owing the Chinese, Mr. Speaker, \$84 billion, to over \$200 billion.

I listen to the debates on the floor of this House, I listen to them in committee, and when I hear my Republican colleagues and my friends on the other side speak about China, it is always with trepidation, it is concern about Taiwan, it is looking at China as a potential threat. And yet here we are, knocking on the door of Mao Zedong's China saying, you know what? Would you buy this instrument from us? Give us your dollars.

I am telling you, I think we are putting not only our economy at risk, but we are putting our national security at risk. It is like having a Middle East gulf state operating American ports without doing due diligence. That is exactly what it is, Mr. Speaker. We are giving the country away.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. DELAHUNT, if I may reclaim my time, I am going to tell you right now, you are talking about giving the country away. We are at the point where half of our debt is going to be owned by foreign nations.

□ 1800

If I may, I just want to, if I can, like you said, bear with me for a minute. I want to make sure that all of you can bear with me for a minute. You have seen this chart before.

The President and this Republican Congress. Well, let me just go ahead and put the Republican Congress on here. We want to make sure that they get good credit for this, because the President could not do it by himself. \$1.05 trillion has been borrowed by this administration within 4 years between 2001-2005.

Forty-two Presidents before President Bush and this Republican Congress were only able to borrow \$1.01 trillion: 224 years. World War I, Mr. Speaker, Vietnam, Korea, Great Depression. You name it. Hurricanes. You name it. Earthquakes. You name it. \$1.01 trillion, 224 years. \$1.05 trillion and counting, if the Republican Congress is not stopped.

What does this mean, Mr. RYAN? Well, this is a map of our great country, the United States of America. We even thought enough to make sure that everyone is in there, Florida Keys and Hawaii and the great State of Alaska. What does it mean? Well, in that \$1.16 trillion that Mr. RYAN talked about as it relates to the foreign investment, Korea owns a little bit of the American pie coming in at \$56.5 billion of our debt.

Well, we can go on down. Germany. Everybody has a piece of this thing thanks to this Republican Congress and the President of the United States. Germany comes in at \$65.7 billion. This bothers me putting these countries on this map, but I just want to make sure, because it is up to us to break this thing down so not only the Members know exactly what they are doing to the country, but not for the country, and they understand exactly what is going on here, because I do not want anyone to say on our watch that this

happened and we did not try to do something about it.

Now, the UK, quote unquote our friend and partner. They own a piece of the American pie at \$223.2 billion, buying our debt. Meanwhile, the President says, follow me. The Republican Congress says, we know exactly what we are doing. Taiwan. Taiwan. People laugh, oh, Taiwan this, Taiwan what. But guess what? They own \$71.3 billion of the American pie and our debt. That means that they own something.

The President says he wants an ownership society. Hello. It is going to other nations. Our neighbor, Canada. I am going to put them right here: \$53.8 billion that they own of our debt. That means that we owe them; financially we owe them.

Just got finished talking about Red China, Communist China. A lot of our jobs are in China. A lot of Americans have to train Chinese workers to take over their jobs, and then they are fired and they are put on some sort of government assistance.

China comes in at a whopping \$249.8 billion. A whopping \$249.8 billion, using a lot of our money because they have a positive trade with us, and we have negative trade with them. But better yet, you let the Republican majority tell you, and the President tells you, oh, we know exactly what we are doing, do not worry, we got you.

OPEC nations. Mr. DELAHUNT, I want you to talk further about this, including Saudi Arabia, comes in at \$67.8 billion of the American apple pie, the American apple pie.

And Japan, the island of Japan I must add, comes in big time, \$682.8 billion. \$682.8 billion. Mr. RYAN, it is not the Meek Report, the Delahunt Report or the Ryan Report. This is reality. And these numbers, Mr. Speaker, as you talk about third-party validators, are from the U.S. Department of the Treasury.

And I guarantee you, Mr. Snow does not report to us or anyone that has a Democrat behind their name. And anyone, I challenge them on the Republican side to march out here and start talking about how they are going to explain this, how they are going to explain selling America to other countries.

How they are going to explain with a straight face, come in here and say, we should make tax cuts permanent for billionaires, meanwhile we are borrowing from other nations to pay for it. How do you explain that, Mr. DELAHUNT? So when you start talking about special deals on ports and folks come out and say, well, I did not know anything about that. Wow, that is not anything new.

I did not know anything about the fact that there were not any weapons of mass destruction. I am tired of folks saying they do not know and we were wrong. I am tired of that. That is not the American way, Mr. DELAHUNT.

Mr. DELAHUNT. We did not know anything about Katrina being a dev-

astating natural disaster. We did not know about FEMA not having the resources. We did not know about the lack of coordination. You know what? You know what? They know nothing. They do not know how to govern.

And that is what I would describe as a habit that has developed over time, a habit of incompetence.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. No doubt about it.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. DELAHUNT, you know what OPEC means and what they owe? I just want to make sure, Mr. Speaker, in case someone may say, well, they pointed out the obvious. Some may say the negative, if you ask the Republican majority. Oh, they are so negative. Well, guess what? We believe in telling the American people the truth.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Find a positive way to explain that. Our friends on the other side who say we are always being negative. Figure out, if they can explain to us a positive way of saying that this country is being sold off to other countries piece by piece.

If they can find a positive way of explaining that, we are open to it.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. There you go. I do not how to do it.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I am just thinking here. You know how the political pundits divide this country up into blue States and red States. Well, you know, if you would bring back that previous poster, you know, you ought to paint those numbers there in red, because here is what is happening to the United States. It is becoming all red. It is becoming all red while we sit here and whistle in the dark.

Because we are indebting ourselves and our future to foreign nations and that map says it all, Mr. MEEK, says it all.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. DELAHUNT, let me just real quickly, because our hour is coming to an end. We, the Democrats, Mr. SPRATT who is our Democratic leader on the Budget Committee, 2006 budget resolution failed 165-264.

Republicans 0-28. The bottom line, no Republicans voted for it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. What is that?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. What this is saying is basically that we want to balance the budget, we want to pay as we go, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Before you can spend any money, you have got to find a way to pay for it.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Not this borrow money from foreign countries stuff. Again, in Spratt substitute amendment to Resolution 393, 2005 budget, again, voted down 224, not one Republican voted to pay as we go, Mr. Speaker.

Now what I am going to do, Mr. RYAN, when we come back in an hour, I am going to read off other examples, at least five others within the last couple of years. We have tried to put this country on the right track. But guess what? The Republican majority has blocked us.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We heard from the President during the State of the Union address a bunch of fuzzy math, but we are going to balance the budget by 2009.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. No, they are saying that they are going to cut taxes. Only we have balanced the budget, the Democratic Congress.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We are going to cut the budget in half by 2009. That reminds me of the old Lou Rawls song, I will see you when I get there. Do you know what I mean?

This is just to put a bow on everything that we have been talking about. When we are paying the interest on all of this debt, you know, we are not borrowing the money from Sky Bank or Home Savings in downtown Warren, Ohio. We are borrowing it from these other countries, and we are paying them debt.

Look what we are doing just on the interest on the debt, Mr. MEEK, Mr. DELAHUNT. This is the net interest we pay in the 2007 budget, what we are going to have to pay, almost \$250 billion just on the interest on all of that money that Mr. MEEK showed you where we are borrowing it from.

But also look what we are not spending it on because of it. Here is education. Here is homeland security. Here is veterans. All of these programs are taking a hit because our friends on the other side do not know how to balance the budget. They waste spending. They lose \$9 billion in Iraq. They waste \$300 billion on 11,000 trailers sitting in the mud in Hope, Arkansas, and meanwhile Pell grants are going up, veterans are asked to pay more, and we cannot take care of our own ports.

We will be back in an hour. But if you want to get a hold of us, Members who are watching this in our offices, [www.housedemocrats.gov/30something](http://www.housedemocrats.gov/30something)

Mr. MEEK of Florida. With that, thank you, Mr. RYAN, Mr. DELAHUNT. We would like to thank the Democratic leader for the time.

#### THE OFFICIAL TRUTH SQUAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMAN of New York). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to come before the House this evening with another edition of the Official Truth Squad to, as we have talked about, kind of set the record straight.

I want to thank the Republican leadership and the Republican Conference for allowing me and other Members of our conference to come and talk this evening.

The group that we have just heard, I was a little encouraged at the very beginning, because the tone was a little different, but then they just could not help themselves. They just could not help themselves. So we launched into

hyperbole, and we launched into disinformation, and we launched into misinformation, and we launched into distortion.

And frankly when I go home, when I talk to constituents at home, they say, what on Earth is going on up there in Congress? Why is it so partisan? And it is just tough to understand how people can be so doggone negative and think that it results in a positive outcome.

It is tough to understand how the politics of division are seen to be the way that we ought to go as a Nation. And it really is remarkable. We are, all of us, on the same team, Republicans, Democrats, Independents. We are all on the same team. We are all Americans.

We have got some incredible challenges that confront us as a Nation. And the politics of division, frankly, they do a disservice to us as a Nation. They are not helpful. I believe they are frankly shameful for the individuals that seem to believe that that is the way that we ought to conduct ourselves in public discourse. It just does not make any sense, Mr. Speaker. It does not make any sense.

It is not new, though. It has been going on in American politics, frankly, for a long time. Some would say that some folks on the other side of the aisle now have elevated it to a grand tradition and to a new height of excellence. But I want to read something that President Abraham Lincoln said that talked about the politics of division and how destructive it is.

□ 1815

He talked about his philosophy of government and social philosophy. "You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. You cannot encourage the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich."

It kind of crystallizes American philosophy, we are all in this together. Mr. Lincoln was a master at putting words and thoughts together and contrast together. I do not think it has ever been said better, frankly.

I highlight that because I encourage my colleagues all across this Chamber to recognize that the kind of politics of division that seems to be practiced by some is not helpful, it is not productive. It does a disservice to all.

We are here with another session of the Official Truth Squad. The Official Truth Squad began when a group of freshman Republicans got together and talked about just what we were hearing from our constituents. Why on earth do you hear the kind of personal accusations that go on up there in Washington?

So we thought we would put together some truthful episodes. So we try to come here almost every night while we are in Washington to bring about some truth and talk about honest, open de-

bate in Washington about a variety of topics.

Truth is incredibly important to the public discourse. If we are not dealing in truth, then we cannot reach the right conclusions. We cannot reach the right solutions to the challenges we have got.

I am joined tonight by a number of folks. I would like to recognize, first, Congresswoman SCHMIDT from the great State of Ohio. She has been just a stellar member of the freshman class and a great proponent of freedom and liberty. We are going to talk a little bit about national security tonight, and Congresswoman SCHMIDT comes with an incredible background and expertise and experience serving at both the local level and the State level and the first woman to represent the district that she represents from southern Ohio.

And we welcome you tonight, Mrs. SCHMIDT. Thank you so much for coming, and we look forward to your words on national security.

(Mrs. SCHMIDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the importance that we as a nation need to continue to do all we can to prevent another terrorist attack on our homeland.

Some of us on this side of the aisle a few weeks ago had the chance to listen to the President, and the President talked about how 9/11 has changed all of us, and it has changed us forever.

I remember that day as if it was yesterday. In fact, a few weeks ago I talked again about how when my daughter lived in New York in Manhattan and we as a Nation witnessed the attacks on the Twin Towers, my daughter and I, we had dinner at the Windows on the World just 30 days before the event. And I knew she did not work close to the building, but I did not know the subway system. So when I saw the towers come down I was scared, scared about where she was. I was also horribly afraid that another attack would occur.

The thing that was so frustrating was my husband and I could not get through to her because cell phones were the only way to get through and the buildings that housed the towers were destroyed. We did not get through to her for 2 full days. It made me realize how important national security and homeland security are for our Nation. Thank God, we only had fear and did not have regret and sorrow as so many others did.

We as a Nation must do everything in our power to prevent another attack. Period.

I rise today to congratulate the hard-working men and women of our intelligence agencies and first responders on preventing another attempt since 9/11. The headlines normally fail to mention that it has been over 4 years since our Nation was hit by those terrorists on that horrific day. I, like most Ameri-

cans, like Congress, wake up every morning feeling safe, proceed with my day without even worrying about the threat of an attack because I know that from law enforcement to our national security apparatus, thousands of highly trained professionals are diligently watching and working and protecting.

Men and women using the latest technologies and a lot of muscle are hard at work around the clock making sure that those that want to hurt us are kept away.

I hope everyone understands that the desire of the terrorist organizations to launch a deadly attack has not subsided. It is their mission to attack and destroy us, to attack and destroy our way of life. But what has changed is that our ability to thwart attacks has dramatically increased.

The latest in database technology, coupled with surveillance technologies, is proving to be a powerful force in identifying those potential attackers who want to kill us. We owe a great deal of gratitude to these men and women on the front lines of our defense.

Just this past week the media reported that some 200,000 people across the globe are on our watchlist, persons that we have reason to believe wish to do us harm, but most importantly, 200,000 people we have already identified as potential threats. And when you know who your enemy is, you have got a better chance at seeing them come at you.

When we wake up each morning and turn on our television sets and there is no news of an attack, we do not even think that there might have been one. That, in itself, is a tribute to the hard work of our national security team. We go about our lives without fear of another attack because of the job they are doing each and every minute of each and every day for us. And that means we must give them every tool needed to complete their mission.

Their mission is not only important, it is a matter of life and death. Our life and death. My life and death. Your life and death, Mr. Speaker.

Much has been said about the National Security Agency's surveillance program in the media. Much of it is nonsense and distortion, and I am so glad we have the Official Truth Squad here tonight to talk about that.

I asked my constituents in a recent survey what they thought about the National Security Agency's surveillance program. Over 2,000 people have responded to date. Slightly less than 80 percent support the program.

Mr. Speaker, 80 percent is a huge number. That is a supermajority of folks, folks like you and me representing all kind of ideologies and political affiliations. Eighty percent want the NSA to continue to do their job so you and I can remain free from terrorist attacks.

The American people, first and foremost, want to be safe in their homes

and go about their lives without that fear again of another 9/11. They exhibit far more common sense than the media ever gives them credit for.

One of our colleagues from the great State of Texas has a great saying that Texas could use a whole lot less of Washington and Washington could use a whole lot more of Texas. I agree. Unfortunately, some day I hope in the very, very far, distant future we may well again be attacked. That attack may well be much larger in scope than 9/11 ever hoped to be. And on that day I hope and I pray that we can all say we did everything in our power we could do to prevent it. That is our responsibility. Do you not agree?

It is our responsibility to give this agency the tools necessary to protect the American people from another terrorist attack. I am glad we are giving them those tools.

It is our responsibility to see that they continue to have them so that you and I can wake up once again tomorrow morning in the freest nation in the world, free to be able to go about doing our business without fear of an enemy knocking at our door.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Thank you so much, Congresswoman SCHMIDT. I appreciate you coming and joining us tonight. Your stories are always spell-binding and very moving.

And the story that you tell of your experience with your daughter on that fateful day is chilling. It brings back all the memories that all of us have and how thankful we all should be, are, can be of the incredible job that the first responders are doing all across this Nation, all across this Nation. So I thank you very much for coming and being with us.

One of the privileges that we have, Mr. Speaker, as you well know, is to gain certain information, to be briefed on certain things that are happening around the world and certain activities that the American Government and American Defense Department are doing. Some of those things we can share, some of them we cannot share, but what I can share with the American people is this certainty.

The fact that since 9/11 we have not had a major terrorist attack on the United States is not a mistake. It is not a mistake. It is not just by chance that we have, as Congresswoman SCHMIDT said, been able to awaken each morning and not really think about the possibility that it might happen again.

There are men and women all across this Nation who are performing heroic tasks day in and day out, and we all should be incredibly grateful and appreciative of their efforts.

I was pleased also to hear Congresswoman SCHMIDT bring up the NSA domestic terrorist surveillance project that is ongoing, a project that has been denigrated by many folks, a project that is frankly having an incredible effect on our national security and our ability to protect ourselves. It is a pro-

gram that was put in place by the President and the National Security Agency. And Congress, the appropriate individuals in Congress, were informed, were in the loop, were given information, were told about it; and now some have kind of changed that story.

But when it came to light in the public and there were discussions about whether or not it was the right thing to do or the wrong thing to do, it appeared to me that it was one of those issues that, as Congresswoman SCHMIDT said, our constituents believed in strongly. So I started asking.

I hold a lot of town hall meetings, and I do a lot of speaking to a lot of groups back home, and when I do I oftentimes ask them. I said, if you had the opportunity as a nation, as the American Government, to know where terrorists were in terms of the use of a phone line, if you could know that and you were able to detect when they were making a telephone call from their home or from their cell phone into the United States, would you want to know what was going on in that conversation?

Mr. Speaker, I promise you I have not had a single soul tell me that they do not think that that is what the government ought to be doing. In fact, what they say is, if we were not doing that, if we were not doing that, then we would not be living up to our responsibilities that we have as a government to do probably the most important thing that we do day in and day out as a Federal Government, and that is to protect our homeland, to provide national security.

So I am certain that the support that we see for this program is universal around the Nation. And we are not talking about listening into an American citizen call to an American citizen call domestically. Remember what we are talking about. We are talking about known terrorist cells, known terrorist phone numbers, a known terrorist identity having communication with someone in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that we have the capability to detect that kind of communication, and I believe strongly, strongly, that my constituents, what they tell me is consistent with what folks believe around the Nation; and that is that we ought to continue that program and we ought to make certain that we are doing what we can do to protect our homeland.

We have also the opportunity so many times to hear from world leaders, and today was a day that I will not forget very soon. We had the Prime Minister of Italy, Silvio Berlusconi, come and he gave an address to a joint session of Congress. I was incredibly struck by so many of the comments that he made. And thank goodness they gave me a translation because my Italian is not very good. But I wanted to highlight a couple of the things that he said, because it just rings so true, and it talks about the incredible importance of what we as a Nation are

doing, having done, and are doing now around the world.

□ 1830

So here are a couple of quotes from Prime Minister Berlusconi that he gave before Congress today. He said, Today, I am still grateful to the United States for the high price in lives you continue to pay in the fight against terrorism to assure our common security and defend human rights around the world. As I will never tire of repeating, when I see your flag, I do not merely see the flag of a great country. Above all, I see a symbol, a universal symbol, of democracy and freedom.

What an incredible picture he draws of what I feel in my heart and I know that so many of my constituents feel about the symbol of our Nation and about the incredibly important work that we are doing as a Nation. To have a leader of another country stand up and say proudly that he believes strongly in the work that the United States is doing to fight terrorism and to commit once again his nation to that fight was just incredibly inspiring.

Prime Minister Berlusconi also said, History has shown that the aspiration to democracy is universal and that liberty and democracy are contagious.

It is just a reaffirmation of what we have talked about for the past number of years and how important this war on terrorism is and how important it is to plant the seeds of democracy around the world. This is what we are doing, and what that does is make it so that we as a Nation are more secure. We are not only more free, but we are more secure as democracy moves around the world.

Here are a couple of other quotes from the Prime Minister. He stood here just in this Chamber today and said, Only democracy can provide liberty and only liberty can guarantee that individuals will be able to develop their talents, channel their energies, achieve their dreams, and conquer prosperity. The only possible road is to work together to spread democracy.

Is that not an inspiring message from another world leader? The only possible road is to work together to spread democracy.

This is the final portion of his speech that I would like to share with you, Mr. Speaker, and with the Members once again of the House and frankly with our citizens. This was incredibly moving. Many of us had tears in our eyes as he closed, and he said, Allow me to conclude by sharing with you a brief story. It is the story of a young man who had just graduated from high school. His father took him to a cemetery that was the final resting place for brave young soldiers, young people who had crossed an ocean to restore dignity and liberty to an oppressed people. In showing him those crosses, that father made his son vow never to forget the ultimate sacrifice those young American soldiers made for his freedom. That father made his son vow eternal

gratitude to that country. The Prime Minister said, That father was my father and that young man was me. I have never forgotten that sacrifice and that vow and I never will.

Incredible words from a world leader, who draws us a picture of a time 60 years ago, 50 years ago, when his father took him to a cemetery filled with American soldiers who had fought for his freedom. He tells us that he was asked by his father never to forget that sacrifice, and he vowed that he never would.

The seeds of liberty, the seeds of freedom, the seeds of democracy that we plant around the world, we may never know when we will see the fruit of that planting. I wonder myself today whether there is an Iraqi man and an Iraqi woman who are telling similar stories to their sons and their daughters and that in 30 or 40 years we would be honored and privileged to have the Prime Minister or the President of a free Iraq come before the United States House of Representatives and tell that same story, as how they were inspired by their mom or their dad as they recognize the sacrifice that American soldiers made on their behalf. An incredible, incredible picture in words.

I had the opportunity to speak to an American Legion group at home a number of weeks ago, and then another American Legion chapter came and visited my office just the other day. I was struck by something that they said. The American Legion's motto is, "For God and country," and it is an appropriate motto: "For God and country."

There is an American Legion division that was supposed to go to an elementary school, a public elementary school in our Nation and tell the young folks at the elementary school about the American Legion, about the history and their heritage. They were called a couple of days before their visit, and they were told, no, we cannot have you come; we have been threatened with a lawsuit because of your motto, "For God and country."

Mr. Speaker, I am just struck by the incredible diligence of all the men and women who fight for our national security, all of the men and women who have fought for our national security, and they recognize over and over and over again that freedom is not free, that there is a price to pay.

Then I am struck by so many individuals it appears that want to destroy the roots that we have that brought about our national security and about our freedom, and I just appreciate so much the opportunity to stand before the House of Representatives as a member of the Official Truth Squad and bring these stories to try to invigorate and uplift the American people to be proud of our heritage, to be proud of the men and women who are serving us so remarkably around the Nation and around the world.

I am pleased now to be joined by a colleague, Congressman STEVE PEARCE,

who is coming and participating with the Official Truth Squad this evening, to talk about our national security, homeland security and bringing some truth and honesty to the debate that we have here in the United States House of Representatives. I am pleased to yield to Congressman PEARCE.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I think your conversation is exactly correct, that right now in America, when I visit the troops in Iraq, the young men and women there ask me one question that I cannot answer, and that is, they ask how come my parents do not see the good things that I am doing on TV at night. How come they only see the bad things? Why is the press trying to mislead the public?

So I appreciate your truth squad here where you begin to talk about the magnificent things that our troops are doing because, when I am there, our troops tell us that we are winning in the neighborhoods and the hearts of the Iraqi people and the hearts of people who distrusted us.

I had three young men there from New Mexico. They call themselves the Three Amigos. They were telling me, when we were out on patrol the first days that we were there, and this was way back at the beginning of the war, they said that the people would peek out their window and open the window curtain and take a look out. The next week, maybe the window curtain was pulled open, the door still locked, the windows down. Gradually, the door opened up, and they would let their kids stand in the door and look at the Americans.

Then they talked about the thing that I found in the Philippines when I was in the Air Force flying into Vietnam when you walk out among kids, and Asia and kids in other parts of the country, the thing they want to do is they want to touch the hair on your arm. So these young troops are saying, you know, the strangest things, the kids came out and the moms are holding them up to our face where the kids can see. They want to touch the hair on our arm. It was exactly the same thing I had experienced back in 1971, 1972, and 1973.

It brings down to me the fact that these Iraqis had been told for 35 years that the Americans will kill you. The truth is Saddam Hussein would kill them. He was always telling them an untruth; and when the truth was known, then the Iraqi people began to settle down.

I would say also that, in this country, if there is a big issue today, one we as a Nation face, it is truth. It is the understanding of what objective truth is. It is the understanding of who can tell us and who will tell us the truth. So I appreciate the gentleman's efforts to bring some truth to this floor because often we have got our friends who come and they talk about special interests and are pointing at the other team. The truth is, the biggest special

interest group in this body are the trial lawyers, and the biggest special interest group in the other body are trial lawyers. They are the ones that are getting the most influence here. Yet our friends seem to forget that they are a special interest group and they are causing great outcomes in legislation.

So I appreciate the gentleman's efforts to bring truth to the floor of the House of Representatives and especially as it regards our troops because our troops are doing magnificent things as they are in harm's way every day. We as a grateful Nation should always take the time to say thank you, not only to the troops but also to families of the troops, for being willing to be the last wedge between tyranny that originates in the Middle East and freedoms that we are trying to export from this country. I think that we owe all of our families and all of our troops a good round of thanks from a grateful Nation.

I salute the gentleman for his efforts.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much. I appreciate you bringing up truth again.

The Official Truth Squad, we have got a quote that we oftentimes refer to that kind of gets to the heart of the matter. It is a quote from Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, and what he said is that everyone's entitled to their own opinion, but not their own facts. So I appreciate so much you bringing truth to the fore, and there are some facts that oftentimes get distorted.

One of them is that people talk about the decrease or the cuts in the defense budget, in the military budget and how on Earth can you continue as we are doing right now by cutting those folks that are protecting us. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the numbers, there are not any cuts at all, and there are not any cuts appropriately because we are in the time that we are in right now and the budgetary authority, which means the amount of money that is able to be appropriated to the military in 2000, was \$287 billion; in the next year, 2001, \$303 billion. It does not look like a cut to me: 2002, \$328 billion, and you see as we go out 2003, \$365 billion; the following year, \$376 billion; and 2005, 2006, \$411 billion.

Now, the truth of the matter is that that budget is appropriately increasing in spite of what you hear from the other side; and, in fact, you hear oftentimes some claims from folks on the other side of the aisle who say that we are not making any progress in national security, we are not making any progress in Iraq. I am always fond of bringing charts and pictures because I think that they speak so much louder than words.

This one is a phenomenal one. We are transitioning in Iraq, in the political environment, in the economic environment and in the military environment; and one of the transitions that is occurring is the transition of force levels of the Iraqi Army. What they are doing is momentous work over there.

In fact, what this chart shows is that in August of 2004 there were only five Iraqi battalions in combat, and you see the steady continual increase, and what many folks will not tell you is that in January of 2006, just a little over a month ago, 98 Iraqi Army battalions in combat.

What does that mean? That means that American soldiers, American men and women who have been serving in this war on terror and protecting your freedom and mine, can begin to come home. That is what that means. So we are making progress along those lines.

To give some other identity to the kinds of progress that is being made over there, this is the statistic that I just mentioned in August of 2004, only a handful of Iraqi Army battalions were in the fight. Now there are nearly 100, but it goes on.

In July of 2004, there were no operational army division brigade headquarters in Iraq, and today, eight brigade headquarters. Thirty-seven battalions have assumed battle space.

In July 2004, a little under 2 years ago, there were no operational special police, commando, public order, mechanized police or emergency response units. Under the Ministry of the Interior in Iraq, not one, not any of them; and in less than 2 years, today, there are 28 such battalions in the battle.

November 2004, there were about 115,000 trained and equipped Iraqi security forces. Today, over 227,000, nearly a quarter of a million trained and equipped security forces and others, if you talk about local police, individuals.

□ 1845

And the experience and the ability of the Iraqi forces has increased remarkably. In December of last year, 2 months ago, the Iraqi armed forces had more independent operations than did coalition forces. Mr. Speaker, did you hear that: more independent operations by the Iraqi forces than coalition forces. Remarkable.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have a couple other folks join me; and fellow Georgian, Congressman KINGSTON, who has such great insight into national security and great service here in the House of Representatives, is here; and I appreciate his coming down.

Mr. KINGSTON. Thank you, Mr. PRICE. I just wanted to say that I have the honor of representing the 3rd Infantry Division in Hinesville, Georgia, and in Savannah, Georgia, as well as the 1st Battalion 75th Ranger Regiment, and in all maybe as high as 20,000 troops from my district who have been in Iraq, the 48th Brigade, some coming and some going. But the thing that struck me as I went to Iraq in December is the amount of the turf, as you have mentioned, which has already been ceded to Iraqi security patrol.

When we were there, 50 percent of Baghdad was already under Iraqi control. And last week, I had the honor of

meeting with General Webster, who was in charge of the 3rd Infantry Division over there, he just got back, and he told me that number now in Baghdad is about 60 percent. In Mosul, 25 to 30 percent of it is under Iraqi security patrol. And the government of Mosul, interestingly enough, is headed by a mayor who is a Sunni, and he has suffered personally. His family has been attacked because of it. Yet, at the same time, here is a guy who is still facing the wind and saying, let's get the job done, and not turning back.

One of the things I know you and I have heard from folks in Iraq and in Afghanistan is, we want to know is America here to stay until we are up and running. I know there are a lot of Democrats who would like to pull out tomorrow, and I understand that. I wish all our troops were home from everywhere. But the message that we got from the folks over there is, we really appreciate what you are doing; we need you to stay until the job is done.

And then as I have talked to the 3rd Infantry soldiers, it is the same thing: we have to finish this job. We just can't faint in the face of adversity. There are so many in America, the Michael Moores, the Cindy Sheehans, the fringe branch of the liberals that want us to cut and run. I think that would be such a huge disservice to all the troops who have died.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. If the gentleman would yield back to me for a moment, I think it is important to note that there are some in this Chamber who want to do just that, who say to pull out immediately. But as we both know, and our constituents and citizens around the Nation know, that is not feasible nor is it advisable.

What is at stake, and I was telling the Members earlier, the Italian Prime Minister today really clearly defined what is at stake: if we as a free people in this world are able to plant liberty and democracy around the world, we increase our security. We increase our security.

And I know that the gentleman would concur with that.

Mr. KINGSTON. That is a message we hear from all over, particularly new Europe, emerging Europe, the Europe that had been 50 years under the Soviet bloc. They understand freedom, and they understand oppression. They do not take it for granted. They are not so anti-American as the Germans and the French seem to be. They do not enjoy the U.S. kicking that so many of our fair weather friends over there do.

But along with military progress in Iraq, there has been tremendous economic progress. As I was there looking down from the helicopter over the streets of Baghdad, I saw small businesses, traffic jams, people moving in and out of buildings buying things and so forth.

There is a port in Iraq that under Saddam Hussein never was used. Today, it has 40 ships a month going into it. In terms of newspapers and

banking, it is coming back. In 2003, there were 13 Iraqi companies listed on the New York Stock Exchange. Today, I think that number is somewhere between 60 and 80. That is a lot of progress.

The GDP last year, I think, was something like \$15 billion. Today it is \$29 billion. A very small economy, but that is a huge step. The unemployment rate was something like 70 percent, and it is now 26 percent. Still very high unemployment rate by our standards, but for the Middle East, pretty doggone good. I can tell you that the Palestinian Authority wishes their unemployment rate were that low.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. It is great that you are able to share those statistics, because what they do is show and demonstrate to the American people that in fact there is a plan and there is progress.

We hear some of our friends on the other side saying there is no plan, nothing is happening over there that is making any progress. But the three-prong plan that you know about well is: one, military, which we have talked about; the other, economic, that you have so clearly identified with the increase in GDP, a 100 percent increase in their economy, the decrease in their unemployment, which is cut by two-thirds, which is remarkable in terms of the progress there; and then there's the third arm, which is the political arm. And what we have seen, what the world has seen over the past year are three independent elections, each with growing participation by the Iraqi people. They understand what is at stake. They understand what is at stake.

So for anybody to even have any sensibility about saying that there just isn't a plan or has not been any progress, just doesn't make sense to me.

Mr. KINGSTON. There is one Sunni province that went from something like a 2 percent voter turnout in January 2005 to December 15, 2005, having over a 60 percent voter turnout. Lots of people risking lives to go to the polls and very enthusiastic about it. When you think about the 300 political parties, when here we worry about Democrats versus Republicans, but 300 different political parties electing 275 members of a new parliament to serve now for 4-year terms, it is going to take awhile to have a coalition government put together. Usually those things take two or three months to happen.

But what I saw when I was over there is people wanting to put down the gun and pick up the pencil and pick up the paper and say let's move from the battlefield to the legislative chamber and debate this.

There are so many challenges to starting a new nation, but what they need right now is the world community behind them. They do not need world criticism behind them. I think sometimes our disagreements with the administration's foreign policy has led us

to be anti-Iraqi people, and I do not think the critics of the administration intend it to be that way, but that is the way it comes out overseas.

So I think we have to say, you know, Democrats and Republicans, and Republicans versus Republicans, can disagree on our foreign policy in Iraq and the war on terrorism; but we have to stand behind the Iraqi people. It is in everyone's interest for Iraq to succeed. And this is the point we are at. We cannot go back and say, well, this is what we should have done in 2003, this is what we should have done here and there. You have to take the situation as it is today and from this point on how are we going to move through the future.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Without a doubt. I am so glad you joined us to talk about this, because that is what the Official Truth Squad is all about, bringing to light the truth of issues, but also understanding and appreciating and articulating what our constituents know, and that is that these challenges are not Republican challenges or Democrat challenges; they are American challenges. They are challenges we all have to face together.

I know the gentleman joins me in just calling on our colleagues to step up, to recognize that the Iraqi people need our support now more than ever before, and to recognize that we have a lot of hurdles, a lot of challenges, but together we can overcome them, as can they.

I appreciate the gentleman's participation tonight and his expertise and perspective to the Official Truth Squad.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, I appreciate being with you.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we have been joined by another great colleague, a gentleman from Texas, another member of the freshman class and a great fellow who has participated in many of these Official Truth Squad activities, Congressman LOUIE GOHMERT, a former judge and chief justice of the court of appeals in Texas. He has just great experience with this area of the history of national security, and he comes tonight to share some of his thoughts with us.

Congressman GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, it is refreshing to hear about good things going on in Iraq. Of course, we know that some have been concerned a civil war may be breaking out over there, but the truth is what this boils down to is they have been finding with the IEDs, these explosive devices that have been killing now both Iraqis and Americans, that that hasn't worked. They have seen we have a President with firm resolve; that we are going to stay the course and make sure the country is ready to stand on its own and then let her stand.

So they realized they were not being successful in that regard, so a last-ditch effort you have terrorists from other areas coming in and blowing up

their own precious mosques to try to turn Shi'a against Sunni. It is obvious that this is a last-ditch effort to try to divide the country, because it scares a lot of folks over there greatly to think about a democracy succeeding right in the heart of the Middle East. I mean, that could spread to Iran. Boy, that scares Iran. It could spread to Syria. There are a number of countries over there that it scares them because democracy, as the President has said, could change things, and those folks are right on each other's borders.

If I could take you back to 1973, between my sophomore and junior year in college, I was an exchange student in the former Soviet Union. Back then we didn't call it the former Soviet Union, it was the Soviet Union, and I spent a summer there and associated with and dealt with college students there in Ukraine, where I was. And I developed a number of friends, one of whom was an engineering student, a smart guy. He spoke a little better English than I did Russian. Well, a lot better English than I did Russian.

We had some wonderful conversations. Very frank, very honest discussions. And at one point he was saying, you Americans seem to not understand why we would cling to communism, but it is the best thing we have ever had. We have had two major wars on our own soil and we have had to divert most everything to defense just to protect ourselves. As he pointed out, you, on the other hand, you have got two major oceans protecting the east and the west.

Think about that. That is profound. And that is something that will be written about the United States hundreds of years from now when someone writes about the rise and fall of the greatest Nation in the history of the world, that we had two major oceans. Now, I would say that is a blessing from God. That is what has allowed this Nation to be nourished and to grow without much threat of intervention from other countries because they had to cross two major oceans to get here.

The thing that concerns me is finding out we are potentially allowing footholds on our own soil. We are giving up an advantage. I didn't realize we had other foreign countries managing, leasing, utilizing avenues of entry in our ports. But now we have one transaction that is up right now with the UAE, the United Arab Emirates. As some have pointed out, the UAE has been our friend since 9/11, and that is interesting in and of itself; but there is a transaction in question that has stirred up much of America, for them to purchase or lease terminals at six of our ports. So I think it bears looking into.

If this goes through, of course they would be handling shipping arrivals, departures, unloading at the dock, and other security sensitive functions. Yes, we would still have our Coast Guard. Yes, we would still have American Customs at work. Some of us are aware

that they do not always catch everything. We are a little sarcastic sometimes in Texas. But they may have containers sitting on their docks for a number of days. They will necessarily be aware of the manner in which our government inspects containers, how it selects the maybe 5 to 6 percent that it actually x-rays, how it goes about selecting which container will be one of the maybe 1 percent that they actually examine.

The current administration has looked at the issue and seems surprised that Americans are really upset about the issue.

□ 1900

And I want to say about this President, he is the first President in at least 30 years to take seriously the threat of a foreign government. I know I was in the United States Army at Fort Benning, Georgia, back when the United States soil was attacked and Americans were taken hostage. That is an act of war. Under international law, you attack somebody's embassy, as ours was attacked in Iran, it is an act of war and it justifies defending yourself. And we did nothing. We begged them to let them go.

And then later, because of a lack of leadership here in Washington, there was a failed rescue attempt that embarrassed us even further. But it sent a message that perhaps we do not have the stomach, we cannot handle these things. Perhaps if we had had an administration in Washington 30 years ago that took care of business when we were attacked, we would not be worrying about these issues now. But it did not and so we do.

Some say, well, since the UAE is one of three nations to have recognized the Taliban as an official government, that that gives them concern, as it should. There are indications that the UAE also saw an opportunity for making money, and so apparently there were al Qaeda moneys that flowed through UAE systems.

But this administration has done more to fight terrorism abroad than any perhaps in history. This terrorism is a relatively new phenomenon for our young country. But we have not done so well at home. And so it bears looking at even more closely.

We need legal immigration. We need people legally coming across the border, willing to work. Most all of us were a result of immigrants, even being here. It is a good thing, if you are willing to work. But we need to secure our borders so terrorists do not come in.

Now, since there is a war going on near our U.S. border, at our U.S. border, and some of us believe there have been insufficient efforts by the Federal Government to intervene and help our sheriffs and those that are trying to fight that war, it gets even more critical.

I personally do not believe that this great Nation should be contracting out any rights to manage, operate, use,

own any avenue of entry into the U.S., whether it is an airport, whether it is a bridge across our border, whether it is a road across our border, or whether it is a terminal in our seaports. That is just problematic.

Now, the UAE has been our friend. They have been helpful to us in the war on terror, and we do want them as an ally. And I hope and pray we have a longstanding relationship with them that just brings us closer.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOHMERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman's comments about the Dubai ports deal, because I know that you have received a lot of communication from home and I have as well. I tell you, it is one of those lightning rod issues that really people have this visceral reaction that we just ought not to be allowing a foreign government to have some type of operational control over our ports. And I tell you—and I could not agree more.

But I will tell you what I think is the wonder and the beauty of our system of government is that what we have is congressional oversight that allows us to get together, we did so just today in the Financial Services Committee, and ask the administration what, how did you reach that decision? Did we touch all the bases? Did we do all the right steps? Did we make all the right steps? The Senate has done the same thing and we will move through this process.

And so I am heartened by a system of government that has checks and balances, that you and I serve in one of those branches, and it allows us to move forward and make certain that we understand what our constituents understand and that the administration understands what our constituents understand, and that is that port security is border security and border security is necessary for national security.

So I appreciate you bringing that issue up.

Mr. GOHMERT. Will the gentleman yield back?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Please.

Mr. GOHMERT. This is also part of an important process. Some people say, why would you come down and talk for an hour on the floor of the House? It is part of educating our colleagues with information we have gleaned in preparing to come here. It is part of educating the people that would bother to watch this on television. And we have picked up some facts. And it is important people understand there are changing relationships, one of the things that concerns us when we have a contract that deals with an avenue of entry into this country with a foreign country.

After World War II, we had no better friend than France. They knew that they had their freedom, they got their country back over the graves of the brave men and women of the United States and other countries, they got it back for them. Our Americans died.

Now, it hasn't been too many years later they have forgotten all about that. Now they call us imperialists. And I get a chuckle when I hear somebody from France saying we are imperialists, because if we really were, they would not be speaking French over there in their country right now, and they would not be running their own country and they would not be calling us names now.

But anyway, they are. But it just shows an example of how things change with other countries, even some that have been dear friends.

And I wanted to point out something else that we learned that helps people assess how close the UAE actually looks at issues like we do. So I went back, I think not only do words have meaning, but votes have meaning; and I have a bill pending that we have filed, the U.N. Voting Accountability Act, and we have got a lot of Republicans, I know, supporting us. I do not know that I have Democrats supporting us. But it basically says any country that voted against us more than half the time in the U.N. the preceding year gets no financial assistance this year. And then it gives the exception for national security, but to the President.

But that caused me to say, well, I wonder how the UAE has voted in the U.N.? Well, I went back and looked. My staff has done a great job helping out. In 2002, the year after 9/11, there were 90 votes in the U.N. Of those, the UAE voted against our position 61 times, with our position, 13 times, abstained 13 times and was absent 3 times. Now, not exactly a real good, helpful voting record for the U.S.

But in 2003, there were 85 votes in the U.N. UAE voted against our position 66 times, with our position they agreed 8 times, abstained 9 times and were absent 2 times. Then I went ahead and put these up.

We do not have 2005 records; those will come out from the U.N. on March 31, according to their own rules. But in 2004, the UAE, well, there were 79 votes in the U.N. in 2004. They voted with the United States 5 times. Oh, good friend, yeah. And then against the United States 62 times, abstained 10 times and were absent 2 times.

So I think those are telling. And I think it is part of the democratic process that as Republicans we feel an obligation, I know I do, to come down and educate people on what it is we are looking back at.

We know no government lasts forever. I know I left the bench because having three daughters, I just could not leave this world without trying to leave this country better than it was when we found it.

I do not want to leave a country that is not secure.

I do not want to leave a country that is overly in debt. And those are reasons, I know we have talked before with my good friend from Georgia, these are things we hold dear that are important to us. And I want to make

sure that in the 100, 200, 300, whoever knows how many years from now when somebody writes *The Rise and Fall of the Greatest Nation on Earth*, it does not fall to us that we let things slip by giving people who may have liked us at one time a foothold on our soil that elevated into something that hurt us down the road.

One other parenthetical. Of course, as an old judge, I am concerned about due process. And I heard the gentleman from Georgia talking about eavesdropping on foreigners calling in here. We know terrorists. By golly, if a terrorist is calling the United States, we need to know what they are saying.

But on the other hand, when you look at due process within the United States, it has been so critical, it is so important to us. If you do not secure the borders and keep out people that want to come in and hurt you, then you are necessarily going to have give up due process rights within the United States to protect yourself and stay secure.

I do not want to do that. I want to secure all our avenues of entry and make sure we do not give up due process rights.

Of course, if you are a terrorist trying to phone home or phone into our home from your home where you hate us, then look out. We are going to be watching.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Texas so very, very much for enlightening us. And I think the take-home message here is that port security is border security and border security is national security. And that is something I think that the American people understand very, very clearly.

And I appreciate you bringing the information about the U.N. votes. We have got, if you look at it, in fact, there are not many nations on the face of the Earth that support us as we would like them to in the United Nations, and we look forward to bringing that information to light.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be a part of the Official Truth Squad, a group that comes down here almost every night and tries to bring some positive information about the United States, who tries to shed light on issues that are so often distorted here in the House Chamber.

The most important thing is, I think, that we all are truly blessed to live in this wondrous Nation. This is a nation that has given more freedom and more liberty and more prosperity to more individuals on the face of the Earth than any Nation in the history of mankind; and it is our privilege, it is our privilege to represent a portion of that Nation here in the House of Representatives.

I once again appreciate the opportunity to share some thoughts with my colleagues here in the House, and look forward to coming back at some point in the future. And I yield back the balance of my time.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL MEMBERS TO THE MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTER-PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania). Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h, and the order of the House of December 18, 2005, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, in addition to Mr. KOLBE of Arizona, Chairman, and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Vice Chairman, appointed on February 16, 2006:

Mr. DREIER, California  
 Mr. MANZULLO, Illinois  
 Mr. DELAHUNT, Massachusetts  
 Mr. FALCONE, American Samoa  
 Mr. ENGLISH, Pennsylvania  
 Mr. WELLER, Illinois  
 Mr. REYES, Texas  
 Mrs. DAVIS, California  
 Mr. FORTUÑO, Puerto Rico.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, it is said that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, Mr. Speaker. And it has been interesting to listen to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

For the last number of years we have had the privilege on our side of the aisle of the leader giving the 30-something Democrats the opportunity to take the floor each night at least for 1 hour, if not 2, to talk about the things that are important to America and, in particular, important to our generation. So now it is nice to see that at least the other side is beginning to recognize that this is an important venue to get some information out to the people. As I said, imitation is the sincerest form of flattery.

There are times, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to agree and times that we are going to disagree. The gentleman from Texas and I were just commiserating, and he and I were both elected just over 13 months ago and sworn into this esteemed body. And I was just joking with him that the chart that he just brought out and talked about related to the United Arab Emirates voting record with the United States and the United Nations is actually a document that I had with me right here in my hand and was one of the things that I was going to discuss as well.

Because I think this port deal, normally we talk about our differences in the 30-something Working Group with the Republicans on the other side of the aisle; in this case, I am heartened to see, at least for some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, we have not differed on the really deep concern that many of us have as a re-

sult directly of our constituents' feedback on this port deal with Dubai Ports World and the administration.

When I can concur with my colleagues, I will do that. In this case, the administration has repeatedly indicated what a good friend the UAE is to the United States. And we only have very few examples that we can utilize to determine what the definition of "friend" is.

One measure of friendship is certainly how often they support us in terms of human rights and the other important issues that come up in the United Nations. There is a pitiful record that the United Arab Emirates has. And in terms of supporting us in the United Nations, not only is it pitiful but it was not so good before 2001, and it has only gotten worse since 2001.

So I stand here and am able to say that I am glad to see that our colleagues have at least pointed out that there is deep concern on the part of the legislative branch, at least some of us in the legislative branch, about the continued rapid-fire movement forward on this port deal.

□ 1915

I continue to scratch my head, we continue to scratch our heads on our side of the aisle, at the brazen nature of the defense that the President has engaged in of this deal. The revelation that came to light less than a week ago now that this is a deal that the President was not even aware of. And I sit on the Domestic and International Monetary Policy, Trade and Technology Subcommittee, which had a hearing today. Not only did we learn that the President did not have any knowledge of this deal but neither did the Secretary that was responsible for each of these agencies that is part of the process to approve the deal nor the Deputy Secretary nor the Under Secretary under them nor the Under Secretary under them. Three levels below the Secretary of each of the agencies responsible for reviewing the foreign investment deals that are proposed to occur in the United States, that was the level of awareness that there was in the agencies like the Department of Homeland Security, like the Department of State, like the intelligence agencies that are involved in the process of approving this. That is so disturbing, it is hard to explain.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that in the time that I have been in Congress and, quite honestly, since I spent 12 years prior to being in Congress in the Florida legislature, and I will even include the 13 years combined that I have served in public office, I have not seen or gotten feedback this quickly and in this enormity in as short a period of time on an issue as I have on this proposed port deal. And I am talking about compared to Social Security privatization, the Medicare prescription drug program.

I get a lot of responses and feedback on those issues, but they are lengthy

and voluminous over a period of time. I have little old ladies and elderly gentlemen call my office, I represent a large senior citizen population, calling my office crying because they are in fear. I represent an area that includes the Port of Miami. My district abuts the Port of Miami. I had an opportunity to tour the Port of Miami Terminal Operating Company and saw firsthand what the potential threat is in the event that this company owned by the United Arab Emirates goes astray in the event that we no longer consider them an ally down the road, that there is absolutely no question that there is a potential national security risk. And for the President and his administration to continue to insist that there is not a national security risk when it is clear that they have not even begun to examine this potential risk closely, that is just shocking.

We have had a number of different revelations that have occurred over the last week, not the least of which is that the Coast Guard brought up their concern during the process, the CPS process, the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States. During that committee's process, the Coast Guard raised concerns. The Department of Homeland Security raised concerns. And let me back up for a second because although there are millions of people who have been paying attention to this, let me take this opportunity to back up for a second and just explain what it is I am talking about.

Of course, so many people are aware that there is a proposal that was considered over the last several months but that only recently came to light by most people in this administration, most people responsible for this decision. It only recently came to light in the last several weeks where we have learned that Dubai Ports World, which is a company, a foreign corporation, owned 100 percent by the government of the United Arab Emirates, is in the process of closing a deal. The deal is supposed to closed tomorrow. They have purchased an interest in P&O, a stevedoring company; and after tomorrow when the deal closes, they will now own and operate the terminal operating companies at six of our major ports. Six major ports.

When you have a proposal like that in the United States, it is supposed to go through the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States. That is made up of a number of different agencies in the United States. It is supposed to include people like the Secretary of Homeland Security, Secretary of State. The Secretary of the Treasury chairs it. You have numerous intelligence agencies that have the highest level, or are supposed to have the highest level, of Secretaries serving on that committee, and they go through a review process, by law. This is a law that they are supposed to follow whereby they take it through a 30-day review process. And after that 30-day review, if there are national security concerns, then that is supposed to

trigger an additional 45-day review, a national security review, so that we can investigate whether there are national security implications to the foreign investment in the United States.

Now, given that the United Arab Emirates just 5 years ago was referred to 58 times in the 9/11 Commission report as having some level of involvement with the 9/11 attacks, knowing that just on the surface, how is it possible that a 45-day national security review was not triggered? Where were the alarm bells? Where was the concern? I mean, one has only to tour the terminals, like I did last week at the Port of Miami, downtown Miami, literally just across the water from the port, and see the devastating potential impact if you have just one or two people. There were not thousands of people that planned the 9/11 attack. It only takes a few determined terrorists to wreak havoc and horror on our Nation. And honestly, it would take almost no one to engage in a terrorist act, God forbid, in the event that our relationship with the United Arab Emirates somehow changes in the near future or down the road. But we will have no mechanism to remove them from our country.

What happens, and what I learned when I went to the Port of Miami to see firsthand the problem, what happens is that it is not that the United Arab Emirates or Dubai Ports World is going to run our ports. That is not accurate. But they are going to have control of the largest terminal operating company, and this is just in Miami, the largest terminal operating company that is responsible for loading and unloading containers in the Port of Miami. There are a million containers that go through the Port of Miami every single year, a million. And this company that is owned by the UAE is going to be in charge of the loading and unloading of those containers. What I learned when I went to the Port of Miami was that while they are not in charge of the security or running the port itself, each terminal operating company is responsible for their own security internally in their terminals and on their property. So because you have a million containers going through the Port of Miami, that is a whole lot of the security measures that are taken on the Port of Miami and that this company, and as a result the UAE, is responsible for.

In addition, what is equally disturbing is that the individuals in the companies that run these terminal operating companies, they have an intimate knowledge of the security measures that are taken on the port grounds itself. So we know two things. One, they are responsible for security within their own terminal for those million containers. One million containers at least at the Port of Miami go in and out of there over the course of a year. And their personnel also have intimate knowledge of the security measures taken at the port every single day. It only takes one or two rogues, it only

takes one or two bitter people, it only takes one or two people who differ even with the government of the UAE, if they currently are our friends, and I would argue that given their track record in terms of the support or lack of support for things we care about in the United Nations and for a number of other reasons that they are not the friends that President Bush represents that they are, but it does not take more than one or two people who hold hate in their heart for the United States and our people to wreak havoc on us. They are not just this close. They would be here. They would be here on our ports on our grounds.

Let us take this a step further because beyond just the United Nations votes that my colleagues talked about and that I just mentioned, we also have the United Arab Emirates that is a member of the Arab League of Nations. The Arab League of Nations is currently engaged in a boycott of the State of Israel. The United Arab Emirates supports that boycott. Now, Israel is the United States' strongest ally in the Middle East. So now we have a second layer of evidence that the United Arab Emirates is not a very good friend of the United States. How could we allow, both for national security reasons and for economic fairness reasons, a country like the United Arab Emirates to do business and to purchase a very significant terminal operating company in our six major ports and allow them to do that kind of business here when they refuse to do business with the State of Israel, our strongest ally in the Middle East? That is unconscionable.

And with all due respect, the President touts his support for the State of Israel and what a good friend this President has been to the State of Israel. Well, I think we have one example here where he is not being such a good friend to the State of Israel if he could turn the other cheek and vociferously defend a business deal even in spite of the fact that this country denies the State of Israel's legitimacy in terms of their existence and engages in harm to the State of Israel by supporting an economic boycott. So to me the proof is in the pudding. I think words are nice, but actions are a whole lot better. Up and down this deal is disturbing.

Now, another colleague of mine, Congressman BACHUS from the State of Alabama, again I want to cite he is also a colleague of mine from the other side of the aisle, in the subcommittee hearing today, he talked about the fact that in the United Arab Emirates, they will not allow the United States to have 100 percent ownership of a company on their port; yet we are allowing the United Arab Emirates to have a 100 percent ownership of a company in our port. And when he asked the administration to explain that, they had no explanation. He was going to have to get back to us. Well, of course he was going to have to get back to us because there

is no explanation for that. This is a matter of fairness. This is a matter of what is wrong versus what is right, and this is a matter of national security.

Now, here is where I am going to part company with my colleagues on this because it is wonderful that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are opposing, rightfully so, this port deal and joining Democrats on our side of the aisle in our concern, our deep and grave concern in opposition to this port deal. However, it would have been far nicer if they had not come so late to the dance in terms of their recognizing that port security is a deep and troubling problem that we have in the United States.

We currently check less than 5 percent of the containers that come through our ports in the United States. Now, that is bad enough. But over the course of the last 5 years, and this is something else I learned when I went to the Port of Miami last week, the difference between our appropriations for airport security, in 5 years we have appropriated an additional \$18 billion for airport security and less than \$700 million for port security. Now, I just could not believe when I learned how lopsided the difference in security measures were. If I am a terrorist, and I am not, but if I am a terrorist, it really does not take a smart terrorist to recognize that if you have that lopsided a difference in terms of the money we have spent to shore up our security at our airports versus our ports, where do you think the weak spot is, and where do you think they are most likely to zero in on in terms of attack?

They are most likely to zero in on port security and that weakness. And now what do we do? Without a national security review, without any concern expressed by this administration whatsoever, we allow a country that just 5 years ago was involved in terms of financing, allowing the financing, housing the 9/11 terrorists, allowing the financing of that attack and, in addition to that, allowing the transport of nuclear material through their country to the state of Iran. That is not allowing, it is not even strong enough to say that that is allowing the fox into the hen house. It is not strong enough to say that.

Where we part company with our friends on the other side of the aisle is in terms of our support for port security, because time and again, Mr. Speaker, the Democrats in this Chamber have proposed increases in funding for port security. We have proposed going from the 5 percent to 100 percent in terms of checking the containers that come through our ports.

□ 1930

Each time we have offered an amendment that would do that, that would accomplish that. The Republicans in this body have rejected it, rejected it with their red lights on that board right above your head, Mr. Speaker.

And that is just so incredibly disturbing, because it is very nice to

stand here on this floor and verbally oppose this ports deal on national security grounds, but when we have an opportunity to do something about it, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see my colleagues join us not just with words, but with their actions as well.

I would like to see them support the Appropriations Committee ranking member on our side, Mr. OBEY from Wisconsin. He proposed last year and the year before just a 5 percent decrease in the tax cuts for our wealthiest Americans who make more than \$1 million a year, the wealthiest, arguably no skin off their noses; and to spend that money, I believe it was an additional \$750 million, I have to double-check that number, but to be able to come close to spending an additional \$1 billion on port security just by dropping the tax cut for our wealthiest Americans by 5 percent.

And that was rejected. The Democrats voted for it and the Republicans voted against it.

So it is very nice, and I am pleased to see, and I have been yearning as a freshman, it is the thing that has caused me the most concern, consternation. Over the course of the last year, my good friend from Texas and I have talked about it many a time; we serve on the Judiciary Committee together. There is too much animosity in this Chamber. There are too many differences. We focus more on our differences than we do on our potential alliances.

This is a time when we have an opportunity to come together. I would like to see us come together in words and in deeds. We have that opportunity here, and it would be great. I am hopeful that henceforth we are going to be able to lock elbows and move together to oppose this deal and to address the national security concerns that deals like this present.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Florida yielding.

We get into Washington, we get up here around the Capitol, we all have our committees and subcommittees, all these things we are trying to oversee and do. I was not aware that it was as easy as apparently it is for a foreign company to manage, own, lease terminals in our ports. Were you aware of that?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. No. I wasn't aware of that either. I was shocked.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments, and I hope we can work together, not only to shore up an avenue of entry through our ports, as you pointed out. We would not let somebody, a foreign government, a foreign-owned company, even our close friends, I would not think, operate an airport or bring their own planes in. Yes, you can check them, we will let Customs do their thing. We wouldn't do that.

We wouldn't lease a bridge to somebody else to operate or manage, I wouldn't think. Gosh, I would hope not.

Anyway, I hope that we can work together towards securing the avenues of entry into this country, because I don't know if you heard me saying it earlier, the gentlelady from Florida, but we all want to be secure. But if we don't secure our outer perimeter, then people that want to hurt us will come in, and then you lose due process rights at that point in order to be secure. I don't want to do that.

So I appreciate your comments and your heartfelt notions on this issue, and hope we can work together.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I look forward to that, and I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

I have legislation that I have introduced just today that your colleague from Texas, Mr. POE, has joined me on that would prohibit foreign-government-owned companies from owning terminal operating companies. I would love to have you as a cosponsor of that legislation.

I hope you lead your conference beyond this port deal and your opposition to it to trying to shore up the port security at our Nation's ports, because unfortunately, your party has been less than supportive of trying to do that. I appreciate you being willing to engage in some dialogue with us. Thank you so much.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would yield, I thank the gentlewoman for taking this time and for making the remarks that she did.

I was in my office working and listening to your presentation, and not only did you lay out a cogent case why this deal with Dubai World Ports makes no sense at all in terms of the security interests of our country, but also the other reasons that you pointed out in terms of their role, in terms of the boycott on Israel and all the other issues of concern there.

But as I left my office, you were also talking about the fact that we have a port security system that still has an awful lot of holes in it. The number of containers, we were told by the CIA that the most likely attack on America would be in a dirty bomb or weapon of mass destruction inside of a container. Now, 4 years later, we still find ourselves where we are inspecting those containers once they arrive in Florida or the San Francisco Bay area in my district, which is far too late.

So even if you thought it would be a good idea to outsource the ownership of these ports to a foreign entity, you certainly would not do it when you have the kind of port security system that we have in place today with so many, so many flaws in that system.

There has been a lot of suggestions about how to get this done. There are ports around the world engaging in very serious screening of these containers, but not all of the ports from which we receive cargo.

So I just wanted to join the gentlewoman in her remarks, because I think there are two issues here. One, this is a real bad deal and doesn't make any sense. People in my district were stunned when the President would say one day he was going to veto it and the next day he hadn't been told about it. He was so well informed he was going to veto it, but not well informed enough to discuss it, because he hadn't seen the deal.

Then, secondly, they think about the problems that we are having trying to secure this worldwide traffic in containers, and they just think that somebody has lost their mind in terms of starting at this point the outsourcing of these ports to foreign ownerships and then, of course, to a country-owned company that has a lot of questionable activities in its background with respect to terrorism and other items.

I just want to thank the gentlewoman for raising these issues. I think it is important, and it is important that they continue to be raised during this 45-day period.

Thank you and the other 30-Some-things for doing this.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It is a privilege to have you down here. The gentleman from California has been a leader for many years. Obviously, there are some significant national security concerns that the State of California has.

We have got to make sure that we have the long-term security interests and needs of this country addressed going forward, and that this debate and dialogue not just be isolated just to this deal. This deal affects six ports in our country, six significant ports. Dubai Ports World will also own terminals and other interests at many other ports in our country. This is actually bigger than this one-port deal.

This is a matter of national security. This is a matter of trying to ensure that, going forward, we fill this gaping hole in our national security.

The two of you sit on the Armed Services Committee. Obviously, you are engaged every single day. Mr. MEEK serves on the Homeland Security Committee and has intimate knowledge of the significant problems we have.

Before I turn it over to one of the two of you, I think that what Mr. MILLER just said is really important to note. Actually, let me go back to what the gentleman from Georgia was saying before you all got here and before I began the 30-something hour.

The gentleman from Georgia made reference to how wonderful it is that we have a legislative process and a system of checks and balances and that the Congress can engage in oversight. It should be noted that the oversight we are engaging in now, we are forcing, we are taking it upon ourselves, because it certainly hasn't been oversight supported by this administration. In fact, the President threatened last week that if we dared to pass any legislation that halted this deal, his all-important business deal, he would veto it.

Now, that doesn't really sound very democratic. It appears to me that this President cares a lot about exporting democracy and not a lot about practicing it.

So I just think that is an important piece of information that our citizens in this country should understand: who is concerned about looking out for our national security interests. It doesn't appear that the administration is.

I would be happy to yield to either of the gentlemen.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Well, I 100 percent agree with you.

You know, the fact that they could even claim that there is some kind of oversight going on is an absolute joke. Anybody who has even been paying the least bit of attention to what has been happening here the past 4 or 5 years can see that there hasn't been any oversight.

The discussion tonight has been about foreign countries running our ports, as if this is the first time, or as if this hasn't been going on. Other countries have, piece by piece, been taking more and more of the United States of America.

In the last 4 years, this has been the increase in our national debt: \$1.18 trillion has been the increase of that debt that this Nation, the Republican House, the Republican Senate and the Republican President have run up. \$1.16 trillion of that has been borrowed from foreign interests.

Of this number, this is what we get from foreign interests, and this is what we borrow from domestic interests. This is piecemeal, piece by piece by piece by piece, selling off the United States of America.

So it is not just the ports, as Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ was saying. This is about the debt, the interest, our country. Who is holding the debt? Japan, China, the Caribbean, Taiwan, OPEC, Korea, all own bits and pieces of the United States. If you look at Japan and China, they own almost \$900 billion, almost the whole kit and caboodle of the \$1.18 trillion that we have. Most of that is owned by Japan and China.

Again, I ask my friends, including the judge who was down here, give us a good, solid way to explain this scenario of our country raising the debt limit, the Republican House and Republican Senate and Republican White House raising the debt limit by \$3 trillion since President Bush has been in, more debt than we have borrowed from foreign interests in the past 224 years, the Republican Congress and the President. How do you explain that and make it sound good, make it sound positive? Because there is no way.

But our constitutional obligation, Mr. MEEK, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, is that we are here to oversee what this President is doing, and if we feel that this President and this Congress, Republican Congress, is not doing what they need to be doing to strengthen the United States of America, then our job is to call you out on it; not because we

want to, but because that is our obligation here. Not because we like it.

This is our second hour tonight. We could be doing a lot of other, different things. But this is important to the country because this President and this Republican Congress is selling this country off piece by piece by piece.

I say this to our friends in Congress, Mr. Speaker, who may be watching in their offices, that if you are a business person, you can't just keep going out and borrowing money and borrowing money and borrowing money; and if business isn't going so well, borrow money. Get it from China, get it from Japan, get it from Korea. You can't go out and borrow and borrow. We have an obligation. The trade deficit with China, \$202 billion from \$84 billion just a few years ago in 2000.

I yield to my friend, who has been just a strong advocate on being a deficit hawk and getting us to balance our budget. I appreciate your leadership.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. You know, Mr. RYAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, I think it is important for us to continue to say it and say it again, that this Congress, the majority side has the President's back. It has the President's back.

I think it is important, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, that we continue to explain that and let it be known they are more committed to the President's back versus the American people's back, and I think it is important that you continue to outline that.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Well, it has been clear on a number of different levels that they have the President's back much more so than the Republicans' back. We can see that when it comes to their support for the President's budget, when they support the President's initiatives at every level.

□ 1945

You see the red and green lights up on the board, and even when the more moderate Republican colleagues of ours obviously desperately want to vote differently, they hold the board open for as long as humanly possible so that they can twist arms and get those colleagues of ours to change their votes and vote differently than obviously their conscience has told them that they should vote.

We are facing down now a need to increase the debt limit. The Treasury Secretary has indicated that we are going to bump up against our debt limit any day now, really within the next month. And we still have not voted to do that. One of the interesting things that I have found politically over the years is that the Republicans often accuse Democrats of being tax-and-spend Liberals. All I ever hear is tax-and-spend Liberal, almost like equating it with curse words.

What has been clear is that the Republicans, since they have been in charge of this government, and in total control of this government, they have been borrow-and-spenders. We have

reached the point in America now where this administration, this President, has spent more than the previous President certainly, and other Presidents combined.

We have spent more money now than the previous administration, yet Republicans continue to accuse Democrats of being tax-and-spend Liberals. It is really just funny. It has reached the point of sardonic humor.

Let us look at the issue of the debt limit. You see here that we have increased the debt limit not just on one, not just on two, but on five occasions. We had had \$3 trillion of increases of the debt limit. In billions of dollars, you have in June of 2002, \$450 billion increase in the debt limit.

In May of 2003, \$984 billion increase in the debt limit. November of 2004, \$800 billion increase in the debt limit. The pending increase now is another \$781 billion for a total of over \$3 trillion in increasing of the debt limit. That means that our future generations, my children, their children, are going to owe incredible sums of money, have debt to foreign nations, and that is not even talking about the deficit.

So many people really have trouble getting their arms around the difference between the debt and the deficit. We have a problem with the deficit in this country. And we have examples of that in chart form as well.

The deficit in this country has now reached \$8 trillion. \$8 trillion. Next week, Mr. Speaker, when we come back and do the 30-something hour, we are going to have a chart that will try to illustrate for people just what that means, what a billion dollars will do. Because it is really staggering when you think about it. People have trouble getting their mind around that concept: \$8 trillion translated to every person in this country means that every person in this country owes \$27,000. And when I am talking about a person, I am talking about infants as well, babies as well.

Let us look at the budget deficits of prior Presidents. If you start with President Reagan in 1982, he had a deficit of \$128 billion. We had a deficit of \$128 billion. You go all of the way down to this President, and we are at \$323 billion.

Now that is just for fiscal year 2006. And that is obviously increased, except for one year where it was a little bit higher. In 2004 it was a little bit higher, \$412 billion. So I feel heartened that we had somewhat of a drop, but it is on the increase again.

We have got to make sure that we get back to the point that we were at during the Clinton administration when we did not know from the term deficit, because we had a surplus. What we were debating during the Clinton administration was what we were going to do with that surplus: Were we going to use it to shore up the difficulties we were having with social security? Were we going to use it to shore up the difficulties that we were having with

Medicare? We cannot have those discussions any more because we are operating at our biggest deficit in history.

What we have proposed, and what Republicans have consistently rejected, is going back to the PAYGO rules, the pay-as-you-go rule, which means you do not spend if you do not have it.

The Republicans have repeatedly and unanimously rejected going back to the PAYGO rules. These are two examples of amendments that were offered by Mr. SPRATT from South Carolina in the 2006 budget resolution and the 2005 budget resolution.

In 2006, it failed 165-264. And you had zero Republicans supporting it, 228 Republicans opposing it. In the 2005 budget resolution, it failed 194-232. Zero Republicans supporting it, 224 Republicans opposing pay-as-you-go.

Now, who is fiscally responsible and who is not? I really ask you to think about that. We have got to make sure that we return to pay-as-you-go, because even though it is difficult, that is a hard policy to adopt, making sure you have the money before you spend it, anyone who lives, if you think about it in terms of your household budget, Mr. Speaker, it is hard to only spend the money you have.

But we all know that you are obviously in the best fiscal shape, you have the most fiscally sound budget in your home when you are only spending what you take in.

There are a lot of Americans that do not do that. There are a lot of Americans that have credit card debt. There are a lot of Americans in this country who struggle every day to make sure that they can pay their bills. And quite honestly, the only way that they are often able to cover the needs that they have is by deficit spending in their own household.

But they know that it is not the right thing to do; and ideally if they could afford it, most of these families would not engage in that practice. The problem is that they are not in very good shape fiscally in their own household, so they have to. The Federal Government does not have to. You definitely cannot argue that we do not have the money to adopt this practice. We do. We have the money; we just do not have the wherewithal.

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership here has not had the nerve. I guess for lack of a better term it has not had the nerve to adopt that responsible policy. I really do not understand it. I come from a State legislative background, 12 years in the Florida legislature. Anyone who comes from a legislative background and was an elected official in their home State in this body understands that every State in the country has to operate in the black, according to their constitution. You cannot deficit spend in a State budget. You cannot do it.

You have only the ability to spend the money that you have. The Federal Government has, I guess it is a luxury, but it is a luxury that comes back to

bite you very soon as you progress down the road, and you end up throwing your own future into tremendous debt.

There is a USA Today editorial that was just from the other day, and it talks about who is really the party of small government and big spending and who is not. It was really interesting. USA Today said tax cuts, they say, forced hard decisions and restrained reckless spending.

The last time we looked, though, Republicans controlled both Congress and the White House. They are the spenders. In fact, since they took control in 2001, they, meaning the Republicans, have increased spending by an average of nearly 7½ percent a year, more than double the rate in the last 5 years of the Clinton era budget. That is really telling.

So who is fiscally responsible? Who is for smaller government? Who is for responsible fiscal policy? Clearly, given this chart, where it indicates in USA Today's opinion, our third-party validator and this chart right here, which shows the increase, drastic increase of the deficit over time from the Reagan administration to now.

Let us look at the blue area right here. See the blue years. The blue years are surplus, Mr. Speaker, surplus, when we did not have a deficit, when we had PAYGO. When we only spent the money that we had.

We had some Members, Mr. Speaker, in our caucus that lost their elections because of that vote, that lost their elections ensuring that we would adopt responsible fiscal policy. That is because we stand on principle.

We do not blindly support our President, we do not walk in lock step, we vote our conscience. And I wish that I had not seen the angst in so many of my Republican colleagues' faces when they had their arms wrenched behind their backs and were essentially forced to vote differently than you know in their heart they believed.

It is really sad. I feel so free to come on this floor and, you know, Leader PELOSI, she tells you, you do what you feel is right. I know we are not always going to agree. You have to be able to do what you think is best for your district. Now, of course, she would like us to be unified. And because we have such strong beliefs and values in our caucus, we have the most unified caucus that we have had in history, really since the 1950s, the most unified caucus.

The Democratic caucus in this Chamber knows that we can take this country in a new direction, that together America can do better, and that if we work together and work through our differences and build consensus instead of forcing our colleagues to do what they do not necessarily believe in, then we are going to make sure that we can come up with sound policy.

The Clinton years we had surplus. The other chart that you just had up is also telling. Again, we do not force peo-

ple in the Democratic caucus to do what they do not believe. I cannot imagine that my Republican colleagues in every single district in this country stood in front of their constituents during their campaigns and said, you know what, I believe in deficit spending. I believe in an \$8 trillion deficit.

I just doubt that if I were in their districts at a town hall meeting, that they would be telling their constituents they were glad that we had an \$8 trillion deficit. But yet they come up here and they vote to continue to support policies like that.

I do not get it. Other than blind loyalty, I do not get it. Blind loyalty is what is hurting our constituents here in the United States of America.

Let us look at how just the interest payments on the national debt, we are going back to talking about the debt, the money that we owe to other countries now. Just look at what the interest payments would pay for if we did not have to spend them on covering the national debt.

If we did not have to spend them, we could spend them on education, we could spend them on homeland security, we could spend them on improving the quality of life for our Nation's veterans. You have about \$50 billion that we could spend on helping our Nation's veterans. You have about, I think that is about \$30 billion that you could spend on shoring up homeland security.

We are talking about domestic discretionary funding, the kind of funding that we can specifically direct to port security and airport security and making sure that our Nation's borders are not infiltrated by terrorists; but we cannot spend that money on those things because we are paying interest on our debt to other countries.

You could spend almost \$100 million, I think it is about \$75 billion dollars, excuse me, we get the Bs and Ms confused sometimes, \$75 billion on education.

Now, one of the biggest frustrations that I know I get in terms of feedback from my constituents, Mr. Speaker, is the No Child Left Behind Act and the fact that this President committed from day one, and Mr. MILLER, my good friend from California who was just here, championed that legislation on our side with the administration's commitment that they were going to support full funding.

We have not had full funding on No Child Left Behind. We have not had the ability to really implement that legislation and ensure that our children in our public schools are prepared for the path that they choose in life. What we have done instead is we have had to spend that money on things like interest on the national debt. We have had to spend that money on tax cuts, because it is tax cuts that have been the top priority of this administration.

Still today this President's and this administration's highest priority appears to be making the tax cuts for our

wealthiest Americans permanent, in the face of the national debt being the size that it is, in the face of us having an \$8 trillion deficit where each American owes \$27,000 apiece.

How is that possible? There are times when you just have to say, we cannot afford it. It would be nice, but we cannot afford it. When does that happen here?

Mr. MEEK, I do not understand when that happens here. You know, I am a mom. I have three little kids. There are times that I have to disappoint my 6-year-olds, my twin 6-year-olds, and my 2½ year old. I have to tell them no, we cannot buy that toy. We cannot buy that toy. I would like to buy you that toy, but we have to save somewhere. We have to do some belt-tightening.

No just is not in the equation with this administration. Sure we can have billions of dollars in tax cuts for the wealthy. Sure we can spend money on whatever we want. Sure we can continue to spiral our deficit bigger and bigger and bigger, and we can go more and more in debt to foreign countries. You know what? It is time for us to act like responsible parents do and occasionally say no.

Occasionally remember that the household budget is something that we have to be responsible about and return to the days when we were only spending what we had, return to the policy of PAYGO.

□ 2000

I just do not understand it. I really do not.

Mr. MEEK, I have been talking about national debt. I have been talking about what we could spend if we had the interest payments on the national debt, what we could do for veterans and homeland security and education. Instead, the net interest that we are spending is \$250 billion. We can see what that would buy and it is really disturbing.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RYAN and I had to run down to an Armed Services Committee meeting. We had a roll call vote. And of course we want to be there for every vote. That is the reason why the people sent us to Washington.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is important to verbalize that those of us on the Democratic side of the aisle have tried to do everything we could to stop the Republican majority and the President from running this country literally into the debt where it is now. Foreign nations owning what they own.

I just want to come for the record because I believe in third party validators. March 30, 2004, Republicans voted 209 to 209, Republicans vote against our resolution 209 to 209 to reject the motion by Representative MIKE THOMPSON to instruct conferees to include PAYGO requirements in that budget, in the FY 2006 budget resolution, in 2004. I am sorry. That was 2004 vote number 97.

A similar measure was on May 5, 2004, Republicans voted 208 to 215. They

voted 215, we voted 208 to reject a similar motion by Representative DENNIS MOORE of Kansas, Democrat. That is 2004 vote number 145.

Another resolution or a vote that we put forth, an amendment similar to November 18, 2004. Republicans voted to block a consideration by Congressman Stenholm at that time to not raise the debt limit which also had PAYGO requirements, not to increase the debt limit. It also had PAYGO requirements. That is 2004 vote number 534.

There are a couple of other votes that you have, Mr. RYAN. Would you call those out.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I would be happy to. This is the pay as you go. This is if you spend money or you give tax cuts, you have got to find other areas to cut spending or raise another kind of revenue. There will be no budget deficits. Everything will be deficit neutral. Pay as you go.

Mr. MEEK just gave 3 scenarios where the Democrats put forth amendments or motions to try to control the spending of the Republican Congress, and in each instance the Democrats all voted for balancing the budget and the Republicans all voted against balancing the budget.

Again, Mr. SPRATT, our good friend from South Carolina who is our ranking member on the Budget Committee, who was the architect of the Clinton balanced budget from 1993 that led to 20 million new jobs and surplus revenue, Mr. SPRATT offered a substitute amendment. Rollcall vote number 87 on March 17, 2005. It failed. Not one Republican voted for the PAYGO that was included in Mr. SPRATT's substitute amendment.

Again, Mr. SPRATT offered another amendment. Rollcall vote 91 March 25 of 2004. Again, pay as you go. Deficit neutral. Help us reduce the deficit. Help us get back to balanced budgets. Again, not one Republican voted for that substitute.

Time and time again, Mr. MEEK, we have offered solutions to this problem to quit selling off our country piece by piece, and the Republican Congress has voted against it.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, as we come in for a close there is so much information to share there is just not enough time to do it, but it is important that we go through that to make sure that not only Members on the majority side know, the American people know, Mr. Speaker, that we are doing everything in our power to be able to stop them from selling our country off to foreign nations.

Let me illustrate this a little bit more. The U.K. owns \$223.2 billion of our debt, Mr. Speaker. I think that is important to identify. You also have Germany. Germany owns \$65.7 billion of U.S. debt. That is what they own of this country. OPEC nations, including Saudi Arabia and other countries, \$67.8 billion of our debt. This is what they own of the United States of America.

It troubles me to put this on the silhouette of our country, but I think it is important that we break this down so the Members know exactly what they are doing.

Taiwan, some may have products and toys from Taiwan, and you say "little Taiwan." Guess what? Little Taiwan owns \$71.3 billion of our debt.

People are so concerned about China, Mr. Speaker, and I am a member of the Armed Services Committee. We are all sworn to protect this country. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, yourself included, Mr. RYAN and other Members in this Chamber, but guess what? Red China, Communist China owns \$249.8 billion of U.S. debt.

The Republican majority is so much out of control until we are running to countries that are communist countries saying, buy our debt. We need it. We cannot stop ourselves. We cannot help ourselves.

Canada, some folks up on the northern border like to go over to Canada but guess what they own? \$58.8 billion of the American pie. You also have Korea, Korea, \$65.5 billion of the American apple pie. And guess what, Japan, the island of Japan, some folks look at Japan on the map, Mr. Speaker, and say, well, it is not as big as the United States of America. But guess what? They own \$682.8 billion of U.S. debt.

We are well on our way, Mr. Speaker, to half of our debt being owned by foreign nations, some that we have some issues with.

So Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ talked about secret port deals and all this stuff, this is what is going on right now. Mr. RYAN, we are going to bring this out as many times as possible. I want the majority side to figure out a positive way to talk about how we owe these countries that I have put here, and others that are unnamed, this kind of money.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Like you said, what is our benefit? We get to fund our deficit and that is about it. We do not go belly up. But what is our benefit? We do not have more money to invest in education as Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ pointed out. We do not have more money to invest for our veterans. This is money that is going to pay the interest on the money that we are borrowing.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, you go back and you say, well, the majority side says, well, we are doing fine. We want to cut the deficit in half. Do not worry. Let us do it. Trust us.

Well, "trust us" has gotten us to this point and this has to stop, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Let me say real quick, trust us, this is the debt limit increases just since 2002. Since President Bush, Republican House, Republican Senate, \$3 trillion in new borrowing from the Republican Congress. This is third party validator. This is fact.

The Truth Squad can come out and check the facts and maybe help us find

a positive way to talk about it. June 2, 2002, the Republicans raised the debt limit by \$450 billion. May of 2003, \$984 billion. November of 2004, \$800 billion.

Now, the next increase is going to be for \$781 billion more. \$3 trillion since President Bush and the Republican House and the Republican Senate have been in charge of this operation here. And we just keep going and borrowing and borrowing and borrowing from the Japanese, the Chinese, the OPEC countries. And at the end it is mortgaging the future of this country.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. When I began the hour I talked about imitation being the sincerest form of flattery so it is interesting to see that they have now engaged in a little dialogue here.

This whole conversation has really been a reflection of the culture of corruption and cronyism and incompetence. Whether it is the debt that foreign countries owe, whether it is the \$8 trillion deficit that we have, whether it is the pitiful and disgusting response to Hurricane Katrina or this port deal that is deeply disturbing and that brought up no national security implications for this President or this administration.

Before we close it out, Mr. RYAN, Mr. MEEK, I do want to urge people to go on the Washingtonpost.com website and see the video that has just been released of President Bush being warned about the dangers of Hurricane Katrina before the hurricane hit and him not asking a single question; him being warned about the levee breaks, warned about the people in the Superdome. There is video. Washingtonpost.com.

We want to thank the Democratic Leader NANCY PELOSI for the opportunity to be here and to spend time with the American people. I know Mr. RYAN will detail how people can reach us, if they have comments, on our website.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I would like to thank Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It is good to have you back.

Mr. MEEK, congratulations again for being elected to chair of the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation. You are such a young member. Congratulations for getting that reward from your peers.

www.HouseDemocrats.gov/30Something. All of the charts that the Members saw tonight can be accessed off this website. The third party validators. This is not KENDRICK MEEK and DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and TIM RYAN making this stuff up. These are facts. And hopefully these facts will lead to us recognizing that we are not doing everything we can and hopefully we can get the country going back in the right direction.

MAKING IN ORDER AT ANY TIME  
CONSIDERATION OF S. 1777,  
KATRINA EMERGENCY ASSIST-  
ANCE ACT OF 2006

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order

at any time to consider in the House Senate bill (S. 1777) to provide relief for the victims of Hurricane Katrina; that the bill be considered as read; that the amendment that I have placed at the desk be considered as adopted; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except 1 hour debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. SOUDER.

S. 1777

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Katrina Emergency Assistance Act of 2006".

#### SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the case of an individual eligible to receive unemployment assistance under section 410(a) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5177(a)) as a result of a disaster declaration made for Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita on or after August 29, 2005, the President shall make such assistance available for 39 weeks after the date of the disaster declaration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

#### COLOMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I sat here and listened to the last special order. It was the longest extensions of remarks devoted to how to increase taxes in America that I have heard.

It is one thing for the other party to criticize us in spending and then vote against every attempt to control the budget. They can criticize us simultaneously as they did in the last hour for not spending enough in education and then not controlling the budget. There was such inconsistency. We are clearly in the season of partisanship, but the harshness and tone and the misrepresentation has been very uncomfortable. And I hope that as we go through this year we can have reasonable debate over very, very difficult questions on international trade, on how we manage our deficit, on how we manage our tax code, on how we manage our spending without the tremendously aggressive tone of partisanship that is increasingly happening in America.

I want to talk about a subject that will hopefully be relatively bipartisan as we move through. It certainly has been in part. And there is a broader issue that has come up, and that is related to the issue of Colombia.

Colombia, most of us think of, if I ask you what do you think of, probably the first thing you think of historically would be coffee. Colombian coffee. Juan Valdez and Colombian coffee. I know in Indiana and at least me from Indiana and many other people would think Colombia is spelled like the District of Columbia. But it is not. If you think it is not, just listen to the accent when they go "Colombian coffee." It is C-O-L-O-M-B-I-A.

Colombian coffee and Juan Valdez were established images in the United States until about the eighties when the number one thing Americans started to think about with Colombia was cocaine.

□ 2015

Almost all, 90-some percent, of the cocaine that comes in the United States and all around the world comes from Colombia. Almost all of our heroin and a high percentage of heroin around the world comes from Colombia. Now Afghanistan has kind of dominated the world on heroin, but in the United States while Asian heroin and Afghan heroin is coming into the west coast, most of the rest of the country has either Colombian heroin or some variation of Mexican heroin.

So now when many people think of Colombia, if I say, oh, I am going to Colombia, people go, well, do not get shot. They do not think do not drink too much coffee. They think do not get shot, and that is partly because of the book by Tom Clancy and then the movie, "Clear and Present Danger," which talked about kind of the height of the Medellin cartel. Then the book, "Killing Pablo," which then was followed up with a movie about Pablo Escobar running the Medellin cartel, and the visions of Colombia from those movies and books have really driven the definition of Colombia.

What I want to do a little bit tonight to lay this out is to tell you a little bit about the history of Colombia; then how, in fact, the drugs because of the American drug habit and the European drug habit, it is not domestic consumption of cocaine and heroin that drove the problems and the violence in Colombia. It was U.S. and European drug addictions that drove Colombia to the situation where they are today.

Then what we have been doing in Congress, starting under the Clinton administration, moving to the Bush administration, with Plan Colombia and the Andean Initiative and some of the impacts of that, and then finishing up with some of the hope of Colombia, which on Monday President Bush and President Uribe of Colombia signed the Colombian Free Trade Agreement and what that would mean both for us and for Colombia and for the Central American region.

So let me first start with this map; and the number one thing that becomes apparent from the map, which I like a lot in this map, is you can tell that it is a geographically diverse country, that it is the start of the Andean mountains. Venezuela is over to the right. Lake Maracaibo, the number one oil region in all of the Americas and possibly in the world, the richest oil well is over there, the big lake, just south of the mountains. The mountain up at the top, I believe, is around 12 to 14,000 feet. Then you come into these kind of lower Andes where you get down to 14,000 feet here and about 8,000 to 10,000 feet in the middle.

If you continue on down, actually the Andes do not go as much directly through Ecuador, but jump over to Peru and down through Chile. Then you get down to the huge Andes, where they are 23,000 feet, and Machu Picchu is in Peru, and then runs down through Colombia down in this range. The equator obviously moves here, roughly through Ecuador, but this whole area is the basic center of the world where the equator is working through.

So all this side to the east is jungle, and you can see these big rivers down here, Putumayo coming through along the border between Colombia and Ecuador, all feed into the Amazon basin. Brazil is over here to the right, and all this area drains into the Amazon River, and then the Amazon River comes out and pours out to the north of Brazil.

In this pattern, first off you see Colombia really has basically three parts. It has a coastal region, and it is, I believe, the only country in South America with both a Caribbean side up there and an eastern Pacific side here. So about half of Colombia is a little more on the Pacific and a little, about half, is on the Caribbean. So it is on both oceans, the Atlantic and the Pacific. Then you have the mountainous region, and then you have this huge jungle.

Now, in understanding the history of Colombia, by looking at the map you start to understand and can more understand the economics of Colombia, the democratic traditions of Colombia and the problem that we have with narcotics in Colombia and how we have been addressing the problems. But if you do not understand the geography, you cannot understand the history very well and the economics and the politics.

First off, there are 1,098 municipalities. Many of these municipalities are very, very small. Most of them are in the mountains. Bogota, here is 7 million people in Bogota. Medellin, which is up a little higher in the mountains, is 2 million people. Cali, which is down over here in the mountains closer to the eastern Pacific, is about 2 million people. Cartagena, which is up kind of in between the edge of Panama and the larger mountain to the top, is about 1 million people. Santa Marta, up towards the big mountain, is about half a million people.

What you see is the bulk of the people are actually in the mountains, but there are small municipalities scattered all through the mountains. Then there are some out here in the Amazon; but the Amazon basin, this whole green area over there, is basically uninhabited except for a very small native population. There are no roads to connect it. There are no airstrips other than the occasional coca producer plain, that it is basically undeveloped. There are a few cities, Barraquilla up towards the mountain between Cartagena and Santa Marta is another 2 million in the city; but other than Barraquilla and Cartagena on the coast, that coast is more developed. This coast has no big cities on it, and most of the people are in the mountains.

So most of the democracy, the histories, the traditions in Colombia are in the mountains, not in the Amazon basin or along the coast.

Well, how did that happen and why did it happen? Partly because they have great temperatures. In Bogota now, it is basically 70 to 72 degrees during the day, and it is about 40 to 50 at night. If you go another time of the year, it is in the 70s during the day and about 40 to 50 at night. In other words, it is fairly stable because Bogota is up at 5,000 to 6,000 feet. So are the other cities. So one thing you had was stable weather.

A second thing which is important to understand, and I should have said this earlier, is that Colombia is the oldest democracy in South America, 200 years. You get this impression sometimes from the news media and other people that all of South and Central America, where all these military dictatorships that do not have a tradition, that Colombia just fights all the time, that they have these revolutions all the time. No, they do not. They have had periods of violence and different things. They had one military general dictatorship for 4 years in the 1950s. That is it. It has been a functioning democracy.

We did not have the most stable government during our Civil War either. Abraham Lincoln held it together the best he could; but we were fighting with each other, and we had a period of civil war, too. In other words, the period of civil war, true, where you had a military governance and a period of civil war was basically the same as the United States.

So Americans who point the finger and say Colombia is a violent country, it is not true. They are an old democracy, an old democracy. Basically, why was Bogota with 7 million people and Medellin with a couple of million people and Cali with a couple of million people, why are they in the mountains? Because to move 100 kilometers, which would be 60 miles, can take you up to 4 hours, 25 kilometers an hour, because you have these roads moving between these cities. Now, if you have a decent road, you can get all the way up to 25

miles an hour. It takes a long time to move between the cities.

So why are they there? Well, because probably more Americans have been to, I think it is safe to say, Hawaii than Colombia. If you go to the Big Island in Hawaii, where are you going to find the coffee? The coffee in Central America, Hawaii, and South America is at elevations between usually 3,000 to 6,000 feet. If you go south of Kahlua-Kona and the famous Kona coffee region in Hawaii, you are going to see the same pattern that you see in Guatemala, in Ecuador, in Colombia and elsewhere, that is, somewhere around mid-afternoon some rain comes in. There is some cloud cover. You are high enough up in the mountains that you get rain and you get steady rain. At the same time, you do not get so much that it drowns your crops. You have the drying out in the elevation, and it gives you a mix.

So you tend to see coffee at 3,000 to 6,000 elevation and with good soil. Colombia's coffee region is in this zone in here where the people are because, for many years, it was Colombian coffee that was their key ingredient that kept their economy going. Ironically, because coffee plantations are relatively small, as you see if you go to Hawaii and other places, it has not been a business that really thrives on huge conglomerate farms. Because you have that mid-size farm, you see this tradition of more, it is not as much of the middle class as the United States, but unlike other countries, where you see, say, bananas dominate or other products completely dominate like oil, like Venezuela, you do not have just a few rich people controlling 90 percent of the wealth. You have more of a middle class, thanks to the historic part of coffee.

But guess what else you have in those mountains: you have gold in those hills. Interestingly, you also have not too far from Bogota almost all the emerald mines in the world. So interestingly, let me give you a little side point that is lost and is very wrapped up in our immigration debate in the United States.

The number one source of income in pretty much every country, in Central America certainly, and even increasingly in South America, is expatriated income. What does that mean? It means that for all the complaining about the wage rates in the United States that the Mexicans who come in the United States, the Guatemalans, the Salvadorans, the Hondurans, Ecuadorans send somewhere between 25 and 50 percent of their wages back to their home country. It started in the smaller countries that that income became greater than any crop they produced; but even Mexico, until the recent rise in oil prices, the expatriated income going back to Mexico was greater than even their oil revenues because their number one business that they export anymore are immigrants who send part of their income back to their country.

Colombia, when I was there last week from Fort Wayne, Indiana, my hometown, we have regional connections. We are a regional airport, but not a hub airport. So everywhere we go, every week when I go back and forth, I live in Fort Wayne and my family is in Fort Wayne, when I go back and forth, I have to take a plane to Detroit or to Cincinnati or to Cleveland or to Chicago or to somewhere to get to Washington. But I could take a plane to Atlanta. I had about an hour and a half in Atlanta and then a plane straight from Atlanta to Bogota.

Bottom line is, I could go from Fort Wayne, Indiana, to Bogota in about net, from the time I got to the Fort Wayne airport with that layover to Bogota, about 9 hours. To come from Fort Wayne to Washington, DC, takes me four to five, and I had the same number of plane switches. Now, with that type of access into Miami from Cartagena, you are talking like an hour and a half flight. It is just a basic short hop over.

Now that said, we have between 600,000 and 800,000 Colombian immigrants in the United States. They tend to be, based on studies, the highest educated group of immigrants from anywhere we have for a variety of reasons, but the bottom line is that expatriated income to Colombia is about \$3 billion. It is 3 percent of their national income.

Now, what sent me into that discussion was gold and emeralds and jewelry are 5.7 percent of their gross national product. Meaning that in gold and emeralds alone, forget coffee which is a huge percent, that they have more of an internal economy than almost anybody in all of Central and South America.

Now, when you look at that, the mix of what they have in their economy, it is not just about gold and emeralds. I know many people, like me, are fascinated with gold and emeralds, and many people are fascinated with coffee; but few people know that the same areas that were doing the coffee and where the gold and emeralds are, when you look at why is so much of the population in Bogota and Medellin and Cali, you have to look at flowers.

Sixty-seven percent of cut flowers in the United States come from Colombia. The flight connections that I just talked about not only work for people; it goes even faster for freight, because the freight companies can do a direct flight into the different regional places and then distribute it. Think about that. If you buy cut flowers, the four big seasons are, I find this interesting, Mother's Day is the biggest, not Valentine's Day. It says something still for our values in the United States. Mother's Day is number one. Valentine's Day is number two. Then I cannot remember whether Christmas or Thanksgiving.

The four big periods that they basically put the stuff in all these huge kind of, for lack of a better word, greenhouses on steroids, just huge flo-

ral operations are located near the different airports because the key thing is how to move these flowers into the United States in basically 24 hours so they can get into the huge chains, the Wal-Marts, the Meyers'es, the Safeways, the Targets, the huge grocery operation wholesalers where most flowers are sold.

□ 2030

We are not talking about what you might get from your local greenhouse; we are talking about the huge operations where flowers are sold. The only real rival is Ecuador on roses. Colombia dominates 67 percent of the American market. Guatemala, I think, has some orchids. So you may find certain specialty flowers in some areas, but Colombia is basically where all our flowers come from. And flowers constitute nearly twice as much as expatriated income.

In other words, now we have got coffee, we have got gold and emeralds and jewelry, and we have flowers. But there is also apparel. Medellin, in particular, is known as an apparel center. So you have another sector of the economy, apparel, that is around 5 percent.

Now, the reason I am raising this is when I get into the drug question, part of the reason we think of, well, these countries, like Afghanistan, I would guess, it is safe to say right now that about 70 to 80 percent of their working economy is related to heroin.

But Colombia isn't dependent on coca; coca is a small percentage. They have businesses in Colombia. They had successful markets in Colombia. America's drug addiction hurt their business. It wasn't that they needed to have a product to sell.

When you go to Bolivia, which had tin, and now President Alva Morales, who came out of the coca growers, because it was very hard to do substitution of other things because coca had been such a critical thing to the Cuchabama area, where President Morales was from, and it was done by a lot of the native peoples. And it is a very difficult question for he and others to handle in a country like Bolivia. But in Colombia they had a different country that was corrupted by America's and Europe's drug habits.

Now, I mentioned apparel, flowers, coffee, gold and jewelry, and others. But guess what their two biggest things are? One is oil. Oil constitutes 26 percent of their exports. There are two big operators and then a smaller EcoPetrol is the Colombian company that is a partner; and basically Colombia owns the ground and the resources. The operating companies are two, B.P. and Occidental.

Occidental is in this range up in there. Now, the question comes, how do you get the oil from there, which is part of this gigantic field that is coming down from Venezuela, to the coast, because you have to go through the mountains? Now, in that challenge, be-

cause unlike the traditional things they had, the oil is scattered up there and down here, the second biggest category besides oil is coal. And coal is in this region right here. Neither of those things are in places where they have very many people.

Now, I want to do one other transition, but I want to illustrate that the biggest categories are energy and their biggest country that uses those imports is the United States. Colombia at one point was our eighth largest oil supplier. According to the President's energy plan, it is now emerging again as one of our primary oil countries. They have an estimate of 47 billion barrels in reserves. That is their estimate. That may be slightly high or it may be slightly low. But in this process of understanding how much oil is there, having a stable Colombia is important to our energy.

The coal mine there is either the second or third biggest in the world, and I will show some pictures of it in a few minutes. And when they get the new mine open, it will be the biggest in the world, and it is low sulfur coal, which means it is safer coal. And where it comes into, the bulk of it, the coal mine in that area is owned by a company that is based out of Alabama, and it is co-owned then with the Colombian Government, and the coal comes into the United States for our energy.

In fact, somewhere near 40 percent of their oil comes to the United States and somewhere near 15 percent or so of their exports are coal to the United States, critical energy sources if we are not going to mine it in the United States. And this is open-pit mining, as opposed to what we are doing mostly in the United States. We are sending miners down below. We have all seen the tragic accidents, and we are battling about mine safety standards in the United States.

But if we don't have coal and we don't do nuclear, and we have pretty well dammed about every river you can dam in the United States. And Canada is pretty much doing the same thing. We have pretty well put windmills about everywhere you can put windmills, and there is now objection and pushback when we do the big windmill farms. We are working with solar.

And there are people worried about oil; they are one of the big oil places where we have enough oil. But if you are going to shut off everything, then your costs are going to go up, because the less supply there is, the higher prices are going to be. And if you regulate it too much, nobody will go down and dig up the reserves in Colombia. So then it won't be so expensive, we just won't have any. We will just get to sit at home maybe and just freeze.

So there has to be an energy supply that helps keep the price down, and it needs to be balanced. And this is relatively clean in a country that is favorable to us.

And before I move into a little more depth with this, I want to share also, in

thinking about Colombia, a couple of other points. Pablo Escobar isn't the primary export or famous Colombian, but we don't necessarily think of the people we might know.

Grammy Award winning Colombian rock stars Shakira and Juanes sell out their concerts in the United States and around the world. They are very famous. I am more familiar with Shakira than Juanes, but they are both taking the U.S. market by storm. Fernando Botero is one of the world's most accomplished painters and sculptors. Wherever you go both in Colombia and other countries, you will see these big, kind of oversized Botero paintings and statues. It is an acquired taste. It is not my taste, but he is very famous.

Gabriel Garcia Marquez is among the world's most widely read novelists and has won basically every writing award you can, and has a home there in Cartagena and is from the countryside. Juan Pablo Montoya has sped to the top of the Formula 1 auto racing circuit. He's a very famous racing driver.

Colombia actress Catalina Sandino Moreno was nominated for an Academy Award for best actress this year in "Maria Full of Grace." So when you watch the Academy Awards, you will see a Colombian as one of the nominees.

I am a big baseball fan, and while Colombia doesn't have as many shortstops as Venezuela, Edgar Renteria, Orlando Cabrera, and other Colombians are in baseball. Even if you set aside all these economic and industrial exports, they also export culture around the world.

The Colombians have stronger universities, they have more educated people, and people who are famously literate and writing many books, not just Marquez, but I wanted to use that as an illustration because we have a warped view in America about what Colombia is that makes it very hard for us to kind of tackle the battles on funding narcotics and what is actually happening in Colombia.

Now, let me talk just for a little here about what happened in the drug wars. To some degree in these areas, the most famous cartel probably in world history is the Medellin cartel. Medellin was the home of Pablo Escobar. Last week, when I was in Colombia, President Uribe, who is originally from the Medellin area, asked me what did I think about Medellin; how did it strike me. And I said, well, my impression of Medellin was that it was a dusty little town and up on the hill Pablo Escobar had this fantastic estate that he had bought with his billions of dollars of American cocaine money, and then bought these exotic animals and started a zoo, and all the people came up to his zoo because they didn't have anything else to do.

Then I flew into the airport that was above the city before we went to the other airport down in the city, and this is just one of their promotional brochures, but this is Medellin. Medellin

isn't a dusty little town that Pablo Escobar had a little house above it with a zoo where people would go because there was nowhere else to go. Medellin is a city of 2 million people with all sorts of businesses functioning in it, with huge high-rises, parks all over the city, all sorts of athletic facilities and arts facilities, and with major universities there.

How in the world did Americans who were tracking it not understand what was happening in Medellin? Partly because of the violence.

I believe in my trip to Medellin this week I was the first Member of Congress to get into Medellin since all the coca wars broke out, because it has been so difficult to travel. Our ambassador was able to drive from Bogota to Medellin, and that is the first time an American ambassador has been able to go on that road for, I believe, 20 to 30 years. Things got really bad, and it left us with a really wrong impression about what Colombia is and what is happening in Colombia.

So Pablo Escobar was controlling the Medellin cartel. And Colombia has been probably the most cooperative country in all of Central and South America in working with extraditions, when we go after these big guys. Why? Why would the different presidents work with the United States when in other countries they have not worked as much with us on extraditing, that is, sending their criminals to the U.S. to go through our court systems? Partly because they had an economy. It was our drugs that wrecked their economy.

There has been some reluctance on the part of some of these countries to send their citizens back to the United States because they are worried. For all the talk about wanting to get rid of the drugs in their country, if they get rid of the drugs in their country, what is going to happen to their banks? Who will build the big buildings? Who will open all the stuff if you suck a couple billion dollars out of most economies and they sink? So to some degree, quite frankly, we get lip service.

But in Colombia they actually extradite, if we can prove the case, major drug criminals. So we broke the Medellin cartel.

Then many Americans know of the Cali cartel, which is another of the big cities I pointed to. It is more over in this zone in the mountains. So we had the Cali cartel, and we broke up the Cali cartel.

In the process of breaking up these cartels, there are three violent groups in Colombia that have dogged over the years and challenged democracy. Rather than participate in elections, because they do not have any support, they chose to use violence. One is the FARC. The FARC are probably the best known, the most violent, and the ones most embroiled in the drug trafficking.

I know some dissident groups want to make the FARC to be like their Che Guevara, communist revolutionaries who just want to have land reform, but,

no, they are a bunch of drug-pushing drug addicts who want to violently overthrow their government because they won't participate in the democratic process. When they founded the FARC, for some of them it was about land reform, but it is long past that. They are basically thugs.

One young man I met, and I have been to Colombia now 11 times, it could be 10, it could be 12 times, somewhere in that range, since I was elected to Congress in 1994, but when you go into Colombia and you talk to them—and I went with colleagues who are now, both of them, governors, Governor Blagojevich and Governor Sanford, and we were waiting for Speaker HASTERT to come into the area.

We weren't as important at the time, so because there was a big rainstorm going on, they turned his helicopter around because they didn't think it was safe, but they brought us in by taking a handkerchief and cleaning off the windshield of the helicopter and trying to find the ground, so we were there for a little bit. And they brought in a captured FARC.

He was a young guy, and we asked him a question, and I can't remember if it was Mark or Rod who said, have you ever killed anybody? And he said, well, yes. And this kid is maybe 18 years old.

And we said, why did you kill him? He said, well, he hadn't paid his fees.

What do you mean, he hadn't paid his fees? He said, well, he owed us money and he didn't pay his fees. He said, I warned him.

We said, well, how did you kill him? He said, well, he was eating lunch at a restaurant and I came up behind him and I took the pistol and I shot him in the back of his head. He hadn't paid his fees.

Now, what the FARC does is they provided protection money first. In other words, if you wanted to grow coca for the different cartels, you paid the FARC, say 5, 10 percent, much like the Mafia worked in the United States in a shakedown operation, and then they "protected" you from U.S. forces. But then they decided that wasn't enough margin, so they started killing the people who wouldn't cooperate and grow coca. They didn't want you growing palm heart, they didn't want you growing bananas, they didn't want you growing coffee. Coca is more profitable, so we will shoot you if you don't.

So Colombia has a huge number of displaced persons right now at the Nelson Mandela kind of training center, a housing center outside the edge of Cartagena where I visited several years ago with Congressmen DAVIS and MORAN, and there are tens of thousands of people who have been chased out of these villages because they were being killed by the FARC for not cooperating in coca and they became drug runners.

The second big group are the paramilitaries, or the AUC. Now, what happened there was, many people started hiring guns, kind of Pinkerton detectives gone bad. They started hiring

guns to fight the FARC. So what happened is, the FARC would come in to one of these villages in the outer areas and basically shoot you if you didn't grow coca; then the paramilitaries, the AUC, would come in and kill you if you did grow coca. And pretty soon the AUC realized, hey, there is more money to be made in coca, so they start fighting over the different zones and over who gets to do the shakedowns. And what used to be the paramilitary protection, instead of operating as paramilitary protection, themselves became drug dealers.

However, interestingly, because of their history of being hired for protection, in this period of being hired for protection, the AUC, the paramilitaries, have about 10-to-12 public support where the FARC only has one or two.

□ 2045

Now from some of the leftist groups in the United States you would think the FARC has 10 to 12 percent or 20 or 30 or 40 percent, but they do not. They have minimal percent. But the paramilitaries, because they were trying to protect the villagers, had more but they went bad too.

Now the third group, the ELN tends to work in these mountains and the mountains up towards the top. The ELN basically does not appear to be as heavily involved in coca. Their business is kidnapping people. They kidnap people for ransom, and that is how they fund their group. Of the two, I do not know how you could say kidnapping is less egregious than coca because at least in kidnapping you just kill the individuals with you. They captured some new tribes' missionaries and killed them. We do not know for sure, but we have not heard from them for close to 8 years now. And others, if they do not get the ransom, the historic pattern is they kill them.

You always hope that the FARC has captured some of our U.S. soldiers, so we can hope they are alive. The FARC is a little different than the ELN. The ELN is kidnapping for money. The FARC is in the business of kidnapping for trade. And if you want to read a great book on the Diary of Kidnapping by Gabriel Marquez, it will give you some idea of what they put these different people through.

But the ELN also appears to, at times, be more willing to work with communities and less violent overall. Even though kidnapping is awful, they are not in the business of cocaine, which kills in the United States 20- to 30,000 people a year of which a big chunk of that is cocaine.

So basically you are not just a kidnapper if you do cocaine; you are a murderer. You are a mass murderer if you are growing fields of cocaine. You can try to coat it over and say, oh, these poor peasants are just trying to make a living. Look, mass murderers. They are killing more people than

somebody going into a school and killing six people.

A coca field growing may be killing thousands of people, depending on how it is broken and how it moves through the city. They are mass murderers in every step of that process. The grower is a mass murderer, the people who process it are mass murderers, the people who transit it are mass murderers, the people who sell it in the street are mass murderers because they are killing people with the cocaine.

It is not this kind of quiet little thing that you are drinking coffee on the side. It is killing people. And in trying to hold that accountable, we have these three different revolutionary groups that have more or less terrorized at the margin. At one point, at the peak of the Medellin cartel, which is what the movie *Clear and Present Danger* is about, based off the book, which is roughly, my first visit into Colombia, former Ambassador Busby was with us, and he was there during the period of the greatest violence. And I said, is the book *Clear and Present Danger* accurate? You were the ambassador during that period. And he said, not completely. I died in the book. But it was basically accurate in that somewhere in the vicinity of two-thirds of the judges and a big chunk of the legislative body was killed. Many mayors were killed.

It is one thing to say we have differences between the Republicans and Democrats and we argue on the House floor about how to do it. We argue back in our districts. But basically it is another thing if you are running for office and they are going to murder you.

President Uribe's father was assassinated. Vice President Santos was kidnapped and escaped. There are very few leaders who do not have huge prices on their heads. And particularly in that period it took incredible courage to be a leader in Colombia.

And then it came back up again after the groups. For a variety of reasons, we got control of the Medellin and Cali cartels. It looked like we were stabilizing it and it took off again, which led to the modern Plan Colombia.

The peak problem here in the second kind of wave that came up was, in the year 1999 Colombia, for all those things I was talking about, had a negative growth rate, the only year it has had a negative growth rate, about a 4 to 5 percent GDP that was negative.

How did they get a negative growth rate? Well, one thing is that I talked about the oil fields up here. That pipeline has to go over the mountains, and in that area, Occidental Petroleum, the oil that was headed for Houston and into the United States, had 91 percent of their oil production stopped that year because they basically had, I think it was 200 pipeline attacks that, even at a fast speed, it takes you a while to fix the pipeline. 24, 48, 72 hours, basically meaning nothing got from the oil fields. Nine percent got there.

I earlier said that oil was 40 percent of their exports. You knock out oil, you cannot get any money.

The big coal mine that we visited, if you are there, how do you get it to the ocean? Certainly not by roads. There are no roads in the jungle. At this huge coal mine the people driving the trucks, let me give you an idea of the scale of this coal mine.

In the U.S. roads nothing can be bigger than 40 tons. Their trucks are 140 tons that this particular coal operation is. It just gives a vague idea of the size of this mine; it is just an incredible scale. You can see a truck that is a 140-ton truck there.

I have been in the iron mines in Montana and Arizona and in northern Minnesota, whether it is copper or iron, the open pit mining. You are talking in this little tiny corner is when we talk about the huge mines. And, in fact, much of this area has already been covered up and started to be reclaimed.

Now, this huge mine, these guys who are driving these 140-ton trucks, they did not know how to drive a car. There are no roads there, or to the degree there are roads, it takes you at most, I said, 15 miles an hour. So most of these drivers, they are training the Colombians, the Drummond oil mine, which is, I mean the coal mine people who come out of Alabama, this is a book on what they have done for social balance. Because when you are up—let me show one other picture, and I want to go back to the big map. I want to show this one for a second from Drummond. This is the coal cars.

In Indiana we have a law that you cannot, a train cannot block an intersection for more than 20 minutes. I asked, do you have a 20-minute rule? They said, no, we have a 30-minute rule.

Now, in that map, and I will have it back up in a minute, but basically it has to go from that coal mine all the way out to the Caribbean Sea. They load 90 cars at a time with coal. The 30-minute rule, because they only have one track, that track has to shut down for 30 minutes so the empty cars can come back in to get reloaded. The operation goes 24/7, 365 days a year. In other words, basically it is a permanent block to an intersection. They do not have a 20-minute rule. The 30-minute rule means you switch directions. So basically you would need an overpass. But they do not have any roads anyway. It is a jungle.

Now what happened with Drummond, because if you are out in the middle of nowhere and you are doing constant filling of train cars as far as the eye can see that direction, as far as the eye can see that direction, that are going 24/7, and you do not have anybody who can drive the trucks, and you do not have very many people, what do you have to do? You have to build the infrastructure.

So they have been building schools in the area. They have been building housing in the area. They have been

doing health care in the area. Seven thousand meals a day are served by Drummond coal mine because when you come into this coal mine they have different various places where you can eat. They provide multiple shifts for people to eat. And they provide 7,000 meals a day, which means that is an incredible food operation. It is an incredible health care operation. And what they have chosen to do is invest in the infrastructure and the people.

Now, what is interesting about this investment in people is that part of the challenge that you have, if you are going to change the drug patterns in Colombia, is you have to have some alternatives for the people. So here is roughly where the coal mine was. It goes up by that big mountain up there and it comes, the train track will go somewhat similar to the oil pipeline.

The trains in 1999 were being shot up and intercepted. You could not get anybody to get coal out if you are going to die, so until you could get a little bit of order, they could not ship coal. So they had a negative growth rate, not because Colombia did not have products, but because Americans got so addicted to cocaine, and Europe got so addicted to cocaine, that it brought a violent group of people into their nation that made their railroads not working, that made their oil pipelines not working, not to mention the mining and the textiles.

Now, what they have now, well, in that railroad in the area, when we were there—and like I say, once again, we were some of the first people to be able to move around in the country. So going up there, I said, are the FARC around here and the ELN and so on? And the president of the company says, no, they are not in the immediate area. They are over there.

Now, over there was, ELN was in the north mountains about 10 miles away and the FARC were in two locations in the south mountains between 8 and 12 miles away. To me that was close. My little hometown of Grayville, Indiana, is 15 miles from downtown Fort Wayne, and I think of it as close to Fort Wayne; and when I said, are they close, I was thinking, Grayville to Fort Wayne terms to me is close, and this is half the distance. But at least they are up in the mountains.

Well, why are they up in the mountains? Two reasons. One is the Uribe government has provided protection. For example, there are now police stations in every municipality. All 1,098 in Colombia now have a Colombian national police presence, which they did not have in 1999. On that train track they have police every so many minutes with a cell phone, and they are each supposed to call in; and if they do not call in, the army goes in to find out what has happened at that point of the track.

So when Members of Congress say, why did you vote for money for pipeline protection, why did you vote for money for this, it is because we are

trying to stabilize the railroad tracks and the pipelines, because if you can do that, the reason the ELN went to the hills is, thousands of these people are working for Drummond coal mine. When they are working for Drummond coal mine and getting health care and getting education and having a job, they do not want a bunch of revolutionaries around. It is not good for their lives. And so they basically fight back.

Now, let me give you a couple of other stories. We spent \$4 billion in Colombia. They spent \$9 billion, and that \$13 billion is what has led to this change in the pipeline. It has led to a change in the ability to move around on the roads. It has led to the change that now they are going to put a second track in on that railroad which will enable us to get more coal into the United States in our southern ports and in our East Coast, low sulfur coal that is environmentally much more favorable to the United States. Because the money that we have invested and the Colombians have invested has stabilized the mountainous zones in the north Colombian zones to a greater degree than it has been for a long time.

Now the economy is growing at a 3 to 5 percent rate, not a negative growth rate like it was in 1999. There is a direct relationship between security and the ability to have economic alternatives.

Let me briefly describe what we did last—well, I said I went to Colombia 10 to 12 times, somewhere in that range; I am guessing 11. But the first time I went to Colombia was not that long after I got elected. We went in and we were the first delegation other than I think Senator SPECTER had been into Cartagena for just a brief period. But we were the first ones to go into the center of the country, into Bogota.

We were allowed to come in for 3 hours. When we landed at the airport we were to duck down, get in a basically tinted window car with machine guns coming out of it, with sharpshooters on all the roofs at the airport all along the route till we got to the embassy. We had so many police going around, anybody who was walking on the sidewalk had to go up to the side of the walls, one person basically kept walking. The police cop went up and pushed them against the wall because they were so afraid we were going to get assassinated.

Ambassador Busby, former Ambassador Busby, who I referred to earlier, who lived and did not die in the book *Clear and Present Danger*, said he had over \$1 million price on his head if they knew he was there. It was a very dangerous place, but we felt we needed to make a statement that we were going to stand with Colombia.

The next time I went back, and the next couple of times we were able to stay finally overnight, I think, about the third or fourth trip. One of the trips we went in with the former chairman of the International Relations

Committee Ben Gilman, a couple of different times as well as with then-Chairman HASTERT that we went into the hospitals because unlike other places in the country and the world, Colombians are dying.

The Colombian national police have lost the equivalent of 30,000 American police officers, given the size and proportion. They are getting shot up all the time. They are not getting shot up because somebody is robbing a bank. They are getting shot up because Americans are using cocaine. Because Americans are using cocaine, they are shooting their police. But they have been willing to fight.

This is partly what we are trying to do in Iraq. What is happening in Colombia is what we are trying to do in Iraq. Colombia has a democracy that we are trying to rescue and keep from going down the tubes, so to speak, and it looks like they are well on their way back.

But we built up their national police. Then we took vetted units in the military that had a horrible human rights track record. It has been a big battle.

We had a ban on U.S. funds going there. We got vetted units. Now they have attorneys that walk around with their different things and they have to graph, if somebody gets killed, which way they were lying so they know they did not use human rights torture.

Sometimes it can be inconvenient when you are fighting terrorists.

But quite frankly, Colombia is doing the best job and the best human rights job of fighting terrorists who do not follow human rights rules, who are more than willing to shoot you in back, are more than willing to use torture. But we have trained vetted units, and whereas in the 1990s, to be kind, the Colombian military defense establishment could not have fought their way out of a paper bag, I have a small town of, say, New Haven in my district of 14,000, I do not think their military could have defeated the New Haven police department.

And their equipment was better than the New Haven police department. They just did not know how to fight. They did not have command and control systems. They ran when they got in a fight with the FARC and it was a disaster.

We trained units who are now winning battles and it is hard to win battles with terrorists. And it is the Colombians who are fighting that we have done the training, and they are even buying equipment. We put 4 billion in, but they put 9 billion in. Even though the drug problem was our problem, not their problem, they have enough of an economy that it is working.

What we are trying to do in Iraq is what is working in Colombia. It has been an investment that has helped rebuild and establish the country of Colombia, such that the kidnappings are down like 67 percent. You can now move around the country. I started to say then after our first trip we were

able then finally to stay after visiting a hospital a couple of times, finally able to stay overnight.

□ 2100

The first time I stayed overnight in Bogota, they took us underneath the hotel just like in the movies and had all these police jumping out; and when we slept in our room, we had multiple police outside each of our doors and on the floor and the perimeter around Colombia. That was a different experience. Finally, they let us go out to eat somewhere other than the hotel. This may have been about the sixth or seventh trip. They let us go out to eat, and when we would go out to eat, we would have to go the wrong way on a one-way street. They would have to seal off the restaurant to make sure that they were not going to assassinate the American Congressmen when we went out to eat. But it was progress. We were going out to eat and we did not have as many police around the hotel, and it showed that there was a gradual progress occurring.

Then we got to go to Cartagena. Then we got to walk around town in Cartagena. Then I went to President Uribe's inauguration; and what I would call a minor setback was as I was sitting with BARNEY FRANK and we heard this big boom, Congressman FRANK said, I have never heard of a one-gun salute. And it was a bomb, mortar shells hitting the side of the presidential palace while we were all inside. We had a cadre of about 20,000 troops around; but these guys, who were getting more and more sophisticated, launched the mortar shells from about 1¼ miles away from the top of a building. As they launched those shells, they were not very accurate and they first were short. Then they hit an apartment building that killed, I think, 40 people and injured 100 or something like that. Then they launched over the palace and they hit the side of the palace where we all were.

But by that time, I think they got 20 or 25 rounds out of 110, but by that time the Colombian Air Force and Army were on their case and they stopped shooting. But that was just about 4½ years ago with the inauguration of President Uribe. So then we continued to make progress.

Now, I mentioned the ambassador could drive. This time we were able to go to Medellin. Nobody has been able to go to Medellin. We were able to go to the coal mine. Nobody has been able to go to the coal mine. We had protection. Yes, we were still in an armored vehicle, but it was a disguised armored vehicle. There were not any machine guns sticking out of it. Yes, the people around us had protection, but you did not see machine guns. And, yes, one of the police cops had a machine gun, but basically they were providing traffic guidance to try to move us. The meeting with President Uribe and others, they did not have a big army sur-

rounding us like we were going to get killed before. You are cautious. It is still a violent country. But we are cautious in parts of our urban cities.

The plain truth is that we have made progress in Colombia in establishing freedom and democracy and giving alternatives. In Medellin, we visited an AUC demobilization center. I mentioned they were the second biggest group, the paramilitaries. 21,000 have now laid down their arms, and we are investing and with some of the money we are eradicating coca to now get these people jobs and to track them and to match them up like the floral industry that is booming in Medellin. And we there met four of the people who had been displaced people from their villages, and we also met a former armed person who had been very violent with the AUC and who has now been trained and went back to get his college degree. Things are really changing in Colombia, thanks in part to our investment.

We still have problems in coca, and the reason I wanted to show you this map is, guess what has happened. The coca has moved out here. It has moved into the jungle. But it is not terrorizing the people. Colombia now has a growing economy. They are providing us with critical things; and with that growing economy, they have asked the United States Government to buy with their money eight Blackhawk helicopters because we have their economy going again. We have stabilized it. It is still a challenge. I am disappointed we have not gotten rid of the coca as much as we thought we would with Plan Colombia, but we have made progress. We have a friend in the region.

Now, this week President Uribe and President Bush have agreed to the Colombia Free Trade Agreement that at some point will come in front of the Congress. No free trade agreement is easy. This is very critical. It was very important for President Uribe to understand that in this process he could not put out everybody in his country and understand in the United States we could not put out.

So, for example, in sugar he would have liked more free trade in sugar. I would have liked more free trade in sugar. In Fort Wayne, Indiana we have Edie's, the largest ice cream plant in the world. We have Kraft caramels up in Kendallville. Bread uses sugar. In Huntington, Indiana, Good Humor has the second biggest ice cream plant in the world. We use sugar. In the South, in Louisiana and Florida, there is a sugar lobby that wants to keep our sugar prices high; but ultimately they are very powerful and in agreement our sugar guys got some protection for a while, for a long while, quite frankly. Way too long for me.

But at the same time in Colombia they grow rice. And if they, in fact, took the rice business away from having some protection, over 15 years they will make the adjustments and you can do that. So this trade agreement is a

balanced trade agreement, trying to work it through.

One of the interesting things is, to give you another kind of wrinkle on how economics work and how trade agreements work, I never thought I would be having a discussion about chicken hindquarters. Colombians tend to prefer dark meat, and Americans tend to prefer white meat. What happens in a trade agreement to say we are suddenly going to have free trade, guess what our chicken companies are going to do? We are going to dump all dark meat on Colombia under its value and put all the Colombian chicken people out of business, which a very important thing in their small villages are their chicken people. So they had to have some kind of protection for hind parts.

But guess who else wanted to have some kind of balance in handling chicken hind parts? Our corn growers. We ship incredible amounts of corn into Colombia. At lunch one of the days, next to me was the head of Archer Daniels Midland in Colombia. He was a Colombian, had been educated in the United States. And the corn that comes in from the Midwest, huge quantities, and in some areas all our corn is going down to Colombia for the chicken farms. If they do not have any chicken farms, we are not going to sell them any corn, which is, I think, our second biggest export to Colombia. We are not going to sell any corn to Colombia if we kill the chicken market. So when you work these exchanges through, both countries, I believe, in this have a balance between the political realities of Colombia and the political realities of the United States.

But here is the bottom line: free trade agreements like this with Colombia will help fuel the economy that has stabilized there more than anywhere else. With Chavez going crazy up there choking us on oil, we need to know where we are going to get oil and energy. We need to know who is going to be our friends in South America. And we need to work with countries that are there.

We also have a secondary motive here. If they grow coca rather than chickens, if they grow coca rather than getting emeralds and gold out of the mine, if they grow coca instead of selling us coal, if they grow coca instead of textiles, we die and Europe dies. We have an incentive directly with the nation of Colombia to make sure that we can make their economy work, that we can make their government successful, that we can have law and order in Colombia, because what is good for them is goods for us; what is good for us is good for them. That is the way it should work.

And I am very pleased that the Presidents of both countries have signed this agreement, and I hope that whether it is this year or next year, we can move that forward because it is extremely important to Central America, South America, and to the United States.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of illness.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of family reasons.

Mr. LATOURETTE (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. LUCAS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of family reasons.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. MCKINNEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WYNN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HONDA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. INSLEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BECERRA, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MATSUI, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CLEAVER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PAUL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCOTTER, for 5 minutes, March 2.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KELLER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GILCHREST, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GOODE, for 5 minutes, today.

## SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2771. An act to clarify that individuals who receive FISA orders can challenge non-disclosure requirements, that individuals who receive national security letters are not required to disclose the name of their attorney, that libraries are not wire or electronic communication service providers unless they

provide specific services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary; in addition to the Permanent-Select Committee on Intelligence and to the Committee on Financial Institutions for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 2, 2006, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,  
ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6347. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Boscalid; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0145; FRL-7757-9] received February 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6348. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pesticide Management and Disposal; Standards for Pesticide Containers and Containment; Notification to the Secretary of Agriculture [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0327; FRL-7749-1] (RIN: 2070-AB95) received February 23, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6349. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the National Polar-orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System Program Acquisition Unit Cost (PAUC) and Acquisition Procurement Unit Cost (APUC) will exceed the 25 percent certification threshold against its Acquisition Program Baseline, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433(e)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6350. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Report of the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6351. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Homeland Defense, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on assistance provided by the Department of Defense to civilian sporting events in support of essential security and safety, covering the period of calendar year 2005, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2564(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6352. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 2006-06, Waiving Conditions on Obligation and Expenditure of Funds for Planning, Design, and Construction of a Chemical Weapons Destruction Facility in Russia for Calendar Year 2006; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6353. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Report to Congress on Head Start Monitoring for Fiscal Year 2004," as required by Section 641(e) of the Head Start Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6354. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, trans-

mitting the Department's report on the Community Food and Nutrition Program for Fiscal Year 2002; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6355. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting a copy of the Energy Information Administration's report entitled "Annual Energy Outlook 2006," pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 790f(a)(1); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6356. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, transmitting the Annual Report of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for Fiscal Year 2004, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 396(k)(3)(B)(iii)(V); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6357. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, transmitting the Corporation's annual report on the provision of services to minority and diverse audiences by public broadcasting entities and public telecommunications entities, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 396 (m) (2); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6358. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Data Collection in Response to Section 1404 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6359. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting a copy of the Department's Energy Fleet Alternative Fuel Vehicle Acquisition Report, Compliance with EPAct and E.O. 13149 in Fiscal Year 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6360. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report on the benefits of enhanced demand response in electricity markets in compliance with Section 1252 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6361. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report on the steps taken along with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to establish a system to make available to all transmission system owners and Regional Transmission Organizations within the Eastern and Western Interconnections real-time information on the functional status of all transmission lines within such Interconnections, pursuant to Section 1839 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6362. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; State of Arizona; Finding of Attainment for Ajo Particulate Matter of 10 Microns or Less (PM10) Nonattainment Area; Determination Regarding Applicability of Certain Clean Air Act Requirements [EPA-R09-OAR-2005-AZ-0006; RL-8029-2] received February 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6363. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2005-CA-0014; FRL-8027-9] received February 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6364. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Refractory Products Manufacturing [OAR-2002-0088;

FRL-8008-02] (RIN: 2060-AM90) received February 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6365. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revision to Toxic Substances Compliance Monitoring Grants (TSCA Section 28) Regulation [OECA-2005-0082; FRL-8031-4] (RIN: 2070-AJ24) received February 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6366. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Georgia Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [GA-200533; FRL-8022-4] received February 23, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6367. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Dearborn County Sulfur Dioxide Emission Limits [EPA-R05-OAR-2005-IN-0007; FRL-8036-3] received February 23, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6368. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Arizona [EPA-R09-OAR-2005-AZ-008; FRL-8022-5] received February 25, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6369. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa [EPA-R07-OAR-2006-0086; FRL-8037-9] received February 23, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6370. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Wisconsin Construction Permit Permanency SIP Revision [EPA-R05-OAR-2005-056 3; FRL-8037-4] received February 23, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6371. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — New Hampshire: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R01-RCRA-2006-0062; FRL-8038-3] received February 23, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6372. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — State Implementation Plan Revision and Alternate Permit Program; Territory of Guam [EPA-R09-OAR-2005-0506; FRL-8030-3] received February 23, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6373. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Disapproval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Colorado; Affirmative Defense

Provisions for Startup and Shutdown; Common Provisions Regulation and Regulation No. 1 [EPA-R08-OAR-2005-CO-0004; FRL-8029-7] received February 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6374. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Texas; Revision to the Rate of Progress Plan for the Beaumont/Port Arthur Ozone Nonattainment Area [EPA-R06-OAR-2005-TX-0003; FRL-8034-7] received February 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6375. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives; Removal of Reformulated Gasoline Oxygen Content Requirement for California Gasoline and Revision of Commingling Prohibition to Address Non-Oxygenated Reformulated Gasoline in California [EPA-HQ-OAR-2005-0170; FRL-8035-2] received February 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6376. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives; Removal of Reformulated Gasoline Oxygen Content Requirement and Revision of Commingling Prohibition to Address Non-Oxygenated Reformulated Gasoline [EPA-HQ-OAR-2005-0170; FRL-8035-1] received February 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6377. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — TSCA Inventory Update Reporting Partially Exempted Chemicals List; Addition of Certain Vegetable-based Oils, Soybean Meal, and Xylitol [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2006-0025; FRL-7760-7] (RIN: 2070-AC61) received February 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6378. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Standards of Performance for Stationary Combustion Turbines [EPA-HQ-OAR-2004-0490; FRL-8033-4] (RIN: 2060-AM79) received February 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6379. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2006-0055; FRL-8030-7] received February 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6380. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Standards of Performance for Electric Utility Steam Generating Units for Which Construction is Commenced After September 18, 1978; Standards of Performance for Industrial-Commercial-Institutional Steam Generating Units; and Standards of Performance for Small Industrial-Commercial-Institutional Steam Generating Units [EPA-HQ-OAR-2005-0031; FRL-8033-3] (RIN: 2060-AM80) received February 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6381. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report on the Commission's actions taken to date and a timetable for further actions needed to conclude its investigation into the unjust or unreasonable charges incurred by California during the 2000-2001 electricity crisis, pursuant to Section 1824 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6382. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, transmitting the second report of 2005, as required by the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987, Public Law 100-203, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 10268; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6383. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, transmitting the second report of 2005, as required by the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987, Public Law 100-203, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 10268; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6384. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Report to Congress on Fiscal Year 2005 Competitive Sourcing Efforts in accordance with section 647(b) of Division F of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004, Pub. L. 108-199; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6385. A letter from the Comptroller General, Government Accountability Office, transmitting information concerning GAO employees who were assigned to congressional committees during fiscal year 2005; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6386. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Definition of Federal Election Activity [Notice 2006-2] received February 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on House Administration.

6387. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Indian General Assistance Program 2006 Grants Administration Guidance [FRL-8024-7] received February 23, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6388. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report of the Office of Justice Programs' Bureau of Justice Assistance for Fiscal Year 2004, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3712(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6389. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's biennial report entitled "2004 Status of the Nation's Surface Transportation System: Condition and Performance Report," pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 308(e)(1); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6390. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of the Army, transmitting the Department's plans to implement improvements to the Inland waterway navigation projects on the Ohio River at John T. Myers Locks and Dam, Indiana and Kentucky, and Greenup Locks and Dam, Ohio and Kentucky; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6391. A letter from the Administrator, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's report on the foreign aviation authorities to which the Federal Aviation Administration provided services for Fiscal Year 2005, pursuant to Public Law 103-305, section 202; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6392. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Transportation Statistics Annual Report

2005, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 111(j); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6393. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Notice of Availability of Final Aquatic Life Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Nonylphenol [FRL-OW-8035-8] received February 23, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6394. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Notice of Availability of Final Recommended Aquatic Life Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Diazinon [FRL-OW-8035-9] received February 23, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6395. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oil Pollution Prevention; Non-Transportation Related Onshore Facilities [EPA-HQ-OPA-2005-0003; FRL-8033-9] (RIN: 2050-AG28) received February 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6396. A letter from the Board of Trustees, National Railroad Retirement Investment Trust, transmitting the National Railroad Retirement Investment Trust's annual management report covering FY 2005, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 231n Public Law 107-90, section 105; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GINGREY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 702. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4167) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for uniform food safety warning notification requirements, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-381). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PICKERING (for himself and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 4824. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for cardiac rehabilitation and pulmonary rehabilitation services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELLER:

H.R. 4825. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to require a licensee to notify the State, county, and public in which a facility is located whenever there is an unplanned release of fission products in excess of allowable limits; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DICKS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington,

Miss McMORRIS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. HERGER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. OTTER, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 4826. A bill to extend through December 31, 2006, the authority of the Secretary of the Army to accept and expend funds contributed by non-Federal public entities to expedite the processing of permits; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. BONO (for herself and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 4827. A bill to authorize a land exchange involving the acquisition of private land adjacent to the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge in Arizona for inclusion in the refuge in exchange for certain Bureau of Land Management lands in Riverside County, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BOSWELL:

H.R. 4828. A bill to provide grants to units of local government and States to hire personnel to monitor the activities of sex offenders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. HERSETH, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. DeFAZIO, and Mr. SOUDER):

H.R. 4829. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to require the incorporation of counterfeit-resistant technologies into the packaging of prescription drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DREIER (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. HARMAN):

H.R. 4830. A bill to amend chapter 27 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the unauthorized construction, financing, or reckless permitting (on one's land) the construction or use of a tunnel or subterranean passageway between the United States and another country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 4831. A bill to confirm as authorized, valid, and enforceable certain contractual rights of water users and water users organizations under the Strawberry Valley Project, Utah; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself and Mr. PORTER):

H.R. 4832. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish an Office of Health Information Technology for the purpose of creating a national interoperable health information infrastructure, to provide loans to health care entities seeking to implement such infrastructure, and to provide exceptions to certain health anti-kickback laws to encourage the dissemination of health information technology; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE:

H.R. 4833. A bill to require that only United States persons may control security operations at seaports in the United States or enter into agreements to conduct such security operations; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. PICKERING):

H.R. 4834. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a business tax

credit for contributions to education scholarship organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4835. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief to promote investments in mine safety; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FEENEY (for himself, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. KELLER, Mr. MACK, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FOLEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 4836. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create Catastrophe Savings Accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California:

H.R. 4837. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the tax incentives for higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHAW:

H.R. 4838. A bill to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. WELLER):

H.R. 4839. A bill to prohibit entities owned or controlled by foreign governments from conducting certain operations at seaports in the United States, and from entering into agreements to conduct such operations; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 4840. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish requirements for appointment of the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico:

H.R. 4841. A bill to amend the Ojito Wilderness Act to make a technical correction; to the Committee on Resources.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself, Mr. POE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. McNULTY):

H.R. 4842. A bill to ensure the security of United States ports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H. Con. Res. 349. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FORTUÑO, Ms. FOX, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GUTNECHT, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KLINE, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KUHLMAN of New York, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

H. Res. 701. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit the consideration of conference reports on omnibus appropriation bills; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. WEXLER):

H. Res. 703. A resolution recognizing the 20th anniversary of the Chernobyl nuclear disaster and supporting continued efforts to control radiation and mitigate the adverse health consequences related to the Chernobyl nuclear power plant; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H. Res. 704. A resolution congratulating the University of Maryland on the occasion of its 150th anniversary; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H. Res. 705. A resolution recognizing and congratulating Apolo Anton Ohno for his historic performances in short track speedskating at the 2006 and 2002 Olympic Winter Games; to the Committee on Government Reform.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 97: Mr. FARR, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. KUHLMAN of New York.

H.R. 354: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RENZI, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 363: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 376: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 450: Mr. DENT, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 633: Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 717: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.

H.R. 791: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 839: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 933: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 998: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. EVERETT.

H.R. 999: Mrs. DRAKE.

H.R. 1053: Mr. KNOLLENBERG.

H.R. 1108: Mr. COSTA, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. McNULTY.

H.R. 1131: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 1136: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. McGOVERN.

H.R. 1219: Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

H.R. 1330: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 1414: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1517: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 1518: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1545: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 1561: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 1595: Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1615: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1639: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1642: Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 1696: Mr. MELANCON.

H.R. 1704: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 1956: Mr. JENKINS, Mr. FEENEY, and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

H.R. 2231: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 2290: Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

H.R. 2348: Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 2389: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 2390: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SIMMONS, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 2554: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 2567: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 2646: Mr. PENCE, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 2788: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

H.R. 2804: Mr. CANNON.

H.R. 2861: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2962: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 3072: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3096: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 3127: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. AKIN, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 3352: Mr. KUHLMAN of New York and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 3361: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 3476: Ms. HART, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 3547: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 3565: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 3569: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 3628: Mr. INSLEE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. McHUGH.

H.R. 3774: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 3861: Mr. DICKS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 3931: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 3940: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 3957: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 4030: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 4062: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 4063: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. STARK, Mr. BARROW, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SHERWOOD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. KUHLMAN of New York.

H.R. 4085: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 4139: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 4156: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 4166: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 4201: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 4211: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. DAVIS of Florida.

H.R. 4217: Mr. WELLER and Mr. HOBSON.

H.R. 4259: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 4298: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 4315: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. McHUGH, and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 4318: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HYDE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 4361: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 4366: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 4407: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 4411: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SHAYS, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 4465: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SABO, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 4493: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 4517: Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 4537: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 4561: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 4582: Mr. McCOTTER.

H.R. 4621: Ms. HART.

H.R. 4623: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 4672: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 4706: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BERRY, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 4715: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 4716: Mr. RENZI and Mr. ISTOOK.

H.R. 4725: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 4737: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 4738: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 4746: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4749: Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4751: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 4756: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BARROW, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 4761: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HERGER, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, and Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 4774: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. McCOTTER, and Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 4777: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 4794: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 4800: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 4807: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. KUHLMAN of New York, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 4813: Mr. HERGER.

H. J. Res. 53: Mr. TURNER.

H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 179: Mr. TERRY.

H. Con. Res. 299: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 339: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. McKEON, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. DREIER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. BONO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H. Con. Res. 346: Mr. CLAY.

H. Res. 116: Mr. COSTA.

H. Res. 305: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LYNCH.

H. Res. 498: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. SABO.

H. Res. 521: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H. Res. 526: Mr. CONYERS.

H. Res. 566: Mr. TANNER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LANTOS, and Ms. CARSON.

H. Res. 578: Mr. SULLIVAN.

H. Res. 601: Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DOYLE, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Res. 658: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. CONYERS.

H. Res. 662: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H. Res. 665: Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. CASE.

H. Res. 673: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H. Res. 681: Mr. HOLT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HONDA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DENT, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. KUHL of New York.

H. Res. 693: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H. Res. 690: Mr. CARTER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. PAUL.

H. Res. 694: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.